THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1927. Vol. XVII.

THE TASK OF THE MODERNIST IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH

By the Editor.

THERE are two classes of Churchmen who hold that there is no work for the English Modernist to do: those who claim that he has no right to exist: and those who claim that his work is done.

We need not concern ourselves with the first class, as they are rapidly diminishing in authority: when they declare that Modernism is a *religio illicita* in the English Church they are easily routed either by an appeal to the modern spirit which is utterly opposed to religious intolerance, or by an appeal to the historic comprehensiveness of the Reformed Church of England. We are concerned then with the second class, who are convinced that the Modernist's work is done. Modernism, it is urged, has become a *religio licita*: prosecutions of heretics will never occur again: most of the laity are Modernist in temper and spirit: almost all the Bishops recognize the right of clergymen to hold and to teach doctrines which would have been utterly condemned a generation ago: they may not view these clergymen with favour; they may not regard them as suitable for promotion to influential positions; but they recognize their right to exist and to teach. This being so, any definite profession of Modernist views, any definite organization to promote and

propagate Modernism is superfluous: the Modernist and his organization came into existence at a critical period in the Church's history, when it seemed that that Church might adopt a policy in conflict with its historic comprehensiveness: the Church, not without something of an internal struggle, has been true to its ideal of a national Church which is both Catholic and Reformed; it has expanded to meet the conditions of thought and feeling of the new age: it has admitted, at least by what it has not done, that there is room within it for Modernist teachers and members; this being so the Modernist in a spirit of deep thankfulness may address himself in the words of the Psalmist, 'Turn again then unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee,' and proceed straightway to disband his organization and relinquish his propagandist efforts.

This view of the Modernist and his task assumes that he exists merely to secure comprehensiveness and tolerance in the English Church, and particularly tolerance of certain Modernist doctrines. Now this is to take much too limited a view of the Modernist and his task. There are many definitions of Modernism, but Mrs. Humphry Ward's seems to us one of the best. It describes most admirably the aim of the Modernist.

> 'Modernism is the attempt of the modern spirit, acting religiously, to refashion Christianity, not outside, but inside the warm limits of the ancient churches, to secure not a reduced, but a transformed Christianity.'

There is one word to which we take exception in that definition. It is the word *ancient*. Modernism has its task to perform not only in the ancient but also in the modern Churches, if the various Free Churches may be so described. The task then of the Modernist in view of this definition is not primarily to secure tolerance for himself and his fellows: his aim is not primarily to keep the English Church comprehensive, it is to re-fashion Christianity within the Churches so as to secure not a reduced but a transformed Christianity.

The Modernist is far from having accomplished that. Modernism is charged with being destructive. It has seemed to many to be concerned with discrediting, with denying, with destroying. Traditional Christianity is plainly losing its authority. The Traditionalists accuse the Modernists of being the cause of this: the Modernists reply with a *Tu quoque*. Whilst

both are agreed that the situation is parlous, each denies his responsibility for that situation. Together they chant in chorus, 'The foundations are cast down, but what hath the righteous done'? Our contention as Modernists is that the righteous has done not too much, but too little. Modernism has been mainly destructive, not willingly, but of necessity. It has had, like the prophets of old, to protest: to protest against false teaching by Christian teachers, false teaching which was destroying the influence of Christianity with thoughtful and sensitive souls. Modernism in the person of F. D. Maurice began by protesting against the terrible doctrine of everlasting torment as presenting an utterly untrue view of God the Father: in Colenso it protested against the assertion of the scientific accuracy of *Genesis* as bound to alienate the scientific world from Christianity: it denied the doctrine of original sin as due to Adam's transgression and as the cause of physical death: it denied in the light of Biblical criticism the historicity of many Old Testament and New Testament narratives: it denied the resurrection of the flesh and the trustworthy character of Jewish apocalyptic pictures portraying the future history of humanity on this planet, and the end of the world: it denied the penal character of Christ's sufferings and that He offered on the Cross a propitiation or satisfaction to God the Father: it denied our Lord's omniscience and omnipotence while subject to the conditions of His incarnate life: it denied His Virgin Birth and physical resurrection and ascension: it denied that there was any specific apostolic authority for the monarchical episcopate: it denied that the gift of tongues bestowed the power to speak foreign languages: it denied the evidential value of miracles and that they were capable of attesting a divine revelation: it denied Biblical and ecclesiastical infallibility. To-day traditional Christianity with its scheme of salvation lies shattered: it has lost intellectual authority with all classes. The Modernists are not to blame for this: the scientists, the historians, the Biblical critics, the metaphysicians, psychologists and anthropologists are the most to blame. The Modernists have but accepted their assertions and repeated them, and this they did not only in the interests of truth, but also as they believed in the interests of Christianity. Not only were they

convinced that no lie is of the truth, but they were also convinced that Christianity ought frankly to abandon every form of untruth and amputate it from its teaching, however painful the operation might prove, being well assured that as Christianity got rid of every form of falsehood and error, so it would become more influential for good. However, the result of all this denial is to give the impression that Modernism is destructive. The charge is a half-truth. This gives the impression that the only Christianity Modernism can offer to humanity is a 'reduced Christianity'—that irreducible minimum which remains after science and criticism and metaphysic have done their uttermost to eliminate lies and legends.

Now the great task of the Modernist is to substitute for a reduced Christianity a transformed Christianity. *Omnis negatio est affirmatio* (Every negation is an affirmation), and if the Modernist denials be examined it will be seen that positive truths of much greater magnitude and importance have been liberated and brought to view by these denials. This has not been sufficiently brought out in Modernist teaching, and it is the pressing task of Modernist teachers to do this in a clear, simple, popular, many-sided, convincing fashion. To do this would at least go some way towards constructing a system of Modernist theology which would take the place of the shattered traditionalist theology, and would help Christianity to regain its hold in the modern world. No reflective Modernist denies the need for a theological system. You must have a philosophy of religion if you are to propagate a religion among educated and intelligent people. The old theological system has no power to grip the modern-minded. The task of the Modernist is to create the system that will grip the modern mind. This is far from easy to accomplish, because as is truly maintained we have no dominant philosophy to-day in the terms of which we might express Christianity, and so win the modern mind; but although we have not to-day a dominant philosophical system, we have at hand certain popular ways of thinking derived from modern science which can be used effectively to construct at least an *interims-apologetic* which should prove immensely helpful in making the Christian Religion appeal to great multitudes who to-day ignore or despise it.

But besides constructing such a Christian apologetic, the Modernist has to win the Church authorities to recognize it as orthodox, that is as a true and legitimate presentation of Christian truth—a right development of it demanded by a growing Christian experience. This is most important. Serious complications arise if the Modernist is teaching what the Church authorities reject or condemn as heretical. An effective Modernist apologetic must secure the hallmark of orthodoxy, and that can only be by winning the Church authorities to accept it wholeheartedly. It must become for them the authoritative interpretation of Christianity, because it is the supremely true and practical interpretation of Christianity.

When we examine the Church practically we observe that teachers are its greatest need. It has numbers of priests and pastors, social workers and games-masters, but it is terribly short of competent modern religious teachers—by which we mean people who really possess a good deal of the new religious knowledge, have some realization of its significance, and are capable of imparting it in a clear, convincing, practical fashion. To train such teachers is no easy matter, but there is enormous need for them. And we dare to add that no one except a Modernist in mind and outlook can be such a teacher; the timid or rigid Traditionalist, however learned and however earnest, cannot supply the need. Our theological colleges, our teachers' training colleges, our missionary colleges are in need of capable, whole-hearted, single-minded, Modernist religious teachers, as are also our schools, and the task of the Modernist Movement is to help to supply them. The Modernist Movement is and ought to be an educational movement, and the first part of its educational task is to produce a constructive Modernist form of teaching, and its second is to train teachers to teach it convincingly; and whilst they teach it to develop, expand and improve it.

We see the need for such teaching not simply at home, but abroad—in our dominions and in the foreign mission field. Those of us who know anything about our Dominions know quite well that traditional Christianity has no future in them: it makes more of a show of vitality than it actually possesses for many responsible people recognize that it is closely bound up with our ancestral morality and our social stability, and they

cannot dispense with it, because they can see no substitute for it. Indeed there are quite a number of sceptics, at least on the Continent, who in the face of the threat of red anarchy are ready even to support the Papacy as a power which makes for political and social conservatism. But this situation is bound to be transitory, and as soon as the Bolshevist threat vanishes, traditional Christianity will lose a further number of its adherents. All these apostates from traditional Christianity are possible converts to a resolute, active, Christian Modernism.

As for the Foreign Mission Field, while traditional Christianity still has good prospects in the world's backyard among the uncivilized races, it has practically no future among the civilized races of the East as their educational standards become Westernized. Any of us who are acquainted with intelligent and educated Orientals know that it is only a Modernist Christianity —a very Modernist Christianity—which is capable of making them Christian. A traditionalist Christianity may win a *per centage* of their uneducated lower classes, but it really has no future as a great moral, spiritual, social and political influence in their communities. Yet we know that definite Modernist teaching on the part of our Anglican missionaries leads to difficulties oftentimes with the home authorities in their missionary society. The modernization of these societies is part of the Modernist's task.

Again, there is the great Re-union Movement. The Lambeth Quadrilateral as a basis of re-union is hopelessly Victorian. The Re-union of Christendom can only be achieved by the patient and courageous development of the Modernist spirit, principles, and methods in all the at present separated Christian bodies, or else Re-union will never be achieved at all. Our Modern Churchmen's Conferences are beginning to bear fruit in this direction, and it is a matter for sincere congratulation that the Congregationalists, under the leadership of Dr. Horton and Dr. Selbie, are going to hold their first Modernist Conference next month in Oxford.

The spirit of Modernism is essentially a unifying spirit: it is a spirit which is for ever striving to break down artificial and conventional ecclesiastical barriers inherited from the past, and to discover syntheses, and it finds the unity it seeks in the realm of truth, love, freedom. It finds it in the strength of moral and

spiritual fellowship and co-operation. It does not find it in assent to a common dogmatic formulary, and in submission to a single ecclesiastical organization.

But those of us who know anything of the inside of the various Christian communions, must know the tremendous opposition—ignorant, prejudiced, inert as it may seem to us—which will have to be overcome before the Modernist spirit can penetrate and prevail in them.

This brief sketch of the present situation will indicate that there is enormous need for the work of the Modernist in the English Church to-day: the work to be accomplished is so vast and the resources with which to accomplish it seem so inadequate that we are perhaps tempted to be down-hearted. As in Apostolic times, so to-day it may be said, 'Ye see your calling, brethren, that not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble are called.' It is, however, the immense need for Modernism which gives us courage to labour, although it would be so much easier to adhere to a conventional and futile traditionalism which is doomed to find its place in the world's great lumber-room of things which have had their use, but are now outworn, or to turn from religious and moral issues altogether and seek our satisfaction in art, or science, or literature, or politics, or sport.

There is then immense need for a brotherhood and sisterhood of whole-hearted, self-sacrificing, sympathetic Modernists who will give all they can to its advancement. Faced as our civilization is by the contending forces of secularism and superstition, it is only Modernism which can unite in a higher synthesis the valuable elements in both. Equally it is only Modernism which can so re-adapt the traditional Christian heritage of Scriptures, dogmas, organizations and rites, that they can still be made to serve the moral and spiritual and intellectual needs of modern men and women. The task is tremendous; it is many-sided, it demands much more self-sacrifice, much more energy, much more faith and courage and patient perseverance, than many seem willing to give, nevertheless it is, to use a phrase from Zarathustra, 'the heavy work of holiness' to which we are called to devote ourselves.

RELIGION IN MODERN GERMANY

By Samuel McComb, D.D.

I.—*The Church and the Revolution.*

THE prophet's vision of the valley of dry bones is being repeated in the Germany of to-day. It is true that among the Germans, as among other peoples, there are many who have learned nothing from the war. Refusing to heed the signs of the times, they can only grumble because things are not what they were and long for the return of a day that is dead. But this is not true of the masses. On the contrary, everywhere there are signs of a rejuvenated spiritual life, of a genuine revival of religion, though, of course, not in the sense of Mr. William Sunday. Indeed one of the most widely-read of present-day German writers, Thomas Mann, has recently prophesied that the hour is about to strike when the German people will once more become a genuinely religious people.

What are some of the signs of this rejuvenescence of religion? To begin with, consider the strange phenomenon which has recently made its appearance, especially among the younger people of Germany. There are thousands who maintain that the truly religious are to be found outside the Christian Churches. They quote Schiller and say they call themselves by no partisan name because such procedure is a denial of religion. They point to a man like Gandhi and say that though a Hindu in every fibre of his soul, he is at the same time an incarnation of the Spirit of Jesus. They maintain that the Churches, so far from interpreting Jesus to the world, have misunderstood Him, have hardened and narrowed His teaching into a dogma or an institution. These people protest against the Churches in the name of the Founder of Christianity.

Then, by way of reaction in the other direction, we are witnessing the rise of sects within and without the organized Churches, formed for the purpose of studying the Bible, not theoretically nor critically, but mystically and with a view to the nurture of the spiritual life. Had these people a leader,

Germany might be once more all ablaze with the fire of a religious revival. Reformations do not come from critics and theorists; they come from simple people whose feelings have been deeply stirred by pure and noble thoughts. Not rationalizations, but fine emotions are requisite to the finer issues of faith.

But after all, the hope of religious reformation is bound up with the fate of the Christian Church. We cannot understand the currents of religious thought and life in Germany, until we see how their organized expression has been affected by political and social changes.

In pre-war Germany, the Churches, Catholic and Protestant alike, held a highly privileged position. They were both officially recognized by the governing authorities. In Protestant Prussia, there was an official Catholic Church; in Catholic Bavaria, there was an official Protestant Church. In Protestant Saxony, the king, now retired, is a Catholic. Dresden, the Saxon capital, has two Court churches, a Catholic and a Protestant. In those States where the political head was a Protestant, the Protestant Church was much more dependent on the State than the Catholic Church, though in the latter the king was consulted in the nomination of bishops, in religious instruction and in various disciplinary matters. Of course, when there was a conflict between the civil and religious authorities, the religious authority, that is to say, the Pope, generally came off victorious.

Such a conflict was not possible in the German Protestant Churches because the supreme power belonged to the king or prince, a power which was not limited by any constitutional authority whatever. Hence, in pre-war Germany, the clergy, Protestant and Catholic, were functionaries of the State. As such they exercised some supervision over the schools and occupied an important place in all public ceremonials. In a word, the ' altar and the throne,' as the popular phrase went, were very closely united. But now the thrones are fallen, and how stand the Churches?

The Germans are a very conservative people: strong in theory, mild in practice. The Constitutional Assembly which met in Weimar in 1919 decided that henceforth the Church, or rather the Churches, should be separated from the State. Liberty

of conscience and independence of the civil powers were the great principles which the Assembly wrote into the public law of the realm. But the separation of Church and State was to be effected gradually and with due regard to the rights affected. Henceforth, the old official Churches are to be regarded as institutions of public utility; they belong to a category (to which philosophic and ethical culture societies also belong) technically called 'Corporations of Public Right.' Taxes are still levied for the support of the Churches and collected by financial officers. But by giving a month's notice of withdrawal from the given Church, the individual is freed from taxation. On the other hand, such an individual cannot legally claim any ministerial or priestly service; he cannot be baptized, or confirmed, or receive Christian burial.

The Revolution, therefore, has set free the Church from the tutelage of the State, has given her complete liberty, and has made her mistress of her own destiny. Yet also, the Church is under the protection of the State: her public worship is respected and is observed in public institutions. But perhaps the wisest and most statesmanlike act of the new régime has been in the decision that the faculties of theology must continue to form an organic part of university teaching. It would have been a calamity to theological science, had the work of German scholars and divines been relegated to sectarian control.

The Revolution made a new constitution for the Church an absolute necessity. Let us take the Prussian Church as typical of all. The General Synod which had not met since 1915 assembled in April 1920, and faced a task greater than any with which it had been confronted since the Reformation. It was decided that a new Assembly must be convened to grapple with the problem. The electors to this Assembly were the parish councils, ultra-conservative bodies. When the Assembly met, it was found that only twenty-eight out of 226 members were liberal-minded men. The result, of course, was that no large-sighted reforms were carried through; only the most necessary changes were made. The Confession of Faith of the reconstructed Church proclaims that the Church is based on the Gospel of Christ Crucified and Risen, our Saviour and Lord, the Apostles' Creed, the Confession of Augsburg, the Articles of Smalkald,

the larger and lesser Catechisms of Luther and the Catechism of Heidelberg.

From this it will be seen that German Protestantism is still saddled with a great deal of 'excess' theological baggage.

It is true that to some extent the Church was democratized; the rights of the laity have been more fully recognized. But the work as a whole is marked by timidity and incompleteness. The Assembly had a great opportunity to inaugurate a movement for ecclesiastical unity. In pre-war Prussia there were seven Protestant Churches: they still remain seven, organized apart within their respective pre-war territories, with different customs and with ecclesiastical officials who bear the title now of 'bishop' and now of 'general superintendent.' The confusion becomes worse when we pass from the Prussian Churches to those of other states. To-day as before the Revolution of 1918, there are Protestant Churches but no one Protestant Church, and none of the existing Churches is a complete or satisfactory expression of German Protestantism.

When the Revolution broke upon the Church, many feared she was about to founder. The Socialists and Communists encouraged their members to secede from the Church, and for a time there was quite an exodus from the Protestant Churches. In 1921 no less than 246,302 Lutherans became professed atheists. But the tide has since been stemmed, and many have returned from the spiritual wilderness. In a private letter of Gustav Frenssen, the well-known novelist, to the writer, there is a significant passage which is worth quoting in this connection:

> 'God has become for many Germans a dark and terrible riddle . . . But I believe that as in the stillness after a great storm a deeply-rooted tree will lift its head again, so faith in God and immortality will rise in new power.'

Recent events tend to confirm this prophecy.

Let us now turn to the fortunes of Roman Catholicism in Germany. During the Revolution and afterwards when the bonds of national unity seemed about to dissolve, and a general spiritual *débâcle* threatened German humanity, the Catholic Church remained apparently the one solid bulwark against the passions of anarchy. Many Protestants became Roman Catholic for the sake of their children and themselves. Some Protestant

leaders, while holding aloof from Rome, tried to imitate Roman ceremonies and disciplinary usages. The 'Association of Modern Christianity' with its organ, the *Christliche Welt*, has considerable influence. It sympathizes with much in Roman belief and ritual. The High Church movement has for its aim the catholicizing of the Evangelical Church; the left wing demands episcopacy with apostolic succession, the restoration of the Eucharist as the centre of worship, less preaching and more devotional and liturgical symbolizing, whereas the right wing rather seeks to form a Church truly national, with liturgical unity, and a presentation of Protestantism arrayed in a Catholic garb.

As was to be expected, the Roman Church welcomes all this as a sign that the Evangelical Church is about to repent and, like the returning prodigal, will fall at the feet of the Holy Father, with the cry, 'Peccavi!' But such hopes do not appear to be on the verge of realization. The drift Romewards has been checked. There are various reasons for this. First of all, Rome is represented in the political world by a distinct party—the party of the Centre, as it is called. Its political ideals are disliked by many who on other grounds would feel the attraction of the Mother Church. Then again, among the masses, the remembrance of their fathers' struggles for freedom and against Roman abuses is still strong, and the German has a kind of subconscious feeling that Rome is anti-patriotic. Still, the Roman Church in Germany was never stronger, never more aggressive, and with her accustomed acumen and strategic skill, knows how to reap profit from the unlovely divisions and dogmatic uncertainties of Protestantism. Indeed, there are many who think that organized Protestantism in Germany is doomed to pass away, and even that this generation may witness its demise.

Meantime, the Roman Church in Germany is seeking to compete with Protestantism in the spheres of literature and philosophy. Up till now she has stood aloof from the main stream of Teutonic culture, but the Revolution has touched her deeply. A revival of scholastic philosophy with a strong polemic against Kantian and post-Kantian thought marks the teaching of Catholic books which are being widely read by German students. This

new movement is also marked by a moving away from the ascetic tendency of post-Reformation Catholicism. It is rather world-accepting than world-rejecting in its general temper.

No one who understands what is going on in the religious world of the Fatherland can doubt that Rome is girding up her loins for a struggle with the Reformed Church for spiritual leadership. The question is: Has the Evangelical Church strength and faith enough to renounce outworn ways, to rise to the challenge of the new age and with a whole-hearted acceptance of democracy reject the imperialism and Erastianism and traditionalist Evangelicalism which have been the secret of its failure to win the German people in recent years.

II.—*Movements of Religious Thought and Life.*

At a first glance one is tempted to say of the religious world of Germany what Archbishop Benson reports was said by an intelligent man when asked what impression the Book of Revelation made upon his mind: 'It makes an impression of sheer chaos.' Yet if we look more closely, certain definite trends which appear to be significant amid much that is ephemeral can be made out.

Among the transient phenomena one must surely reckon the demand within the bosom of Protestantism for a truly 'Germanic Church.' Its champions argue that the Old Testament is not to be compared in richness and spiritual depth with the sagas and legends of the German race. A truly German Church will, therefore, prefer its own traditions and eliminate from Christianity its Jewish inheritance. A strong anti-Semitic prejudice finds expression here. Along with this goes belief in the inherent superiority of the Aryan race, the best representatives of which are to be found in Germany. Recently, a Germanized Englishman, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, made the startling discovery that Jesus was not a Jew but an Aryan. From this, of course, it was an easy step to the doctrine of the ultra-nationalists that He was a German. These people attributed the defeat of the Germans in the World War mainly to the influence of the Jew in the national life. Get rid of the Jew and Judaism, give the people pure Christianity, that is, the teaching of Christ un-

contaminated by the doctrines of St. Paul, and at last we shall have a true and satisfying religion. In other words, Christianity is to return to the Pagan ideal of a national cult. It ought not to be and cannot be an international faith.

Ephemeral, too, must be reckoned the sects which, born of the sufferings of the war, have recourse to apocalyptic dreams. Their Society is called 'The International Union of Earnest Bible Readers.' Depressed by the calamities of recent years, they remain attached to the Christian religion, but they see no future for the Church or the world. They stake all their hopes on the visible coming of Christ to mend the world by ending it. Wars, famines and earthquakes are but the heralds of the coming catastrophe. Only when Christ comes will there be an end of war and the real reign of His Kingdom. Public lectures of an eschatological character, with such titles as 'Germany in the Light of the Bible,' 'The Fate of Germany and the End of the Age,' are delivered in the large cities and are attended by thousands. Among the humble people who take this melancholy view the Church of Latter Day Saints is gathering here and there some converts.

Turning from these extreme tendencies, let us consider some movements of a more reasonable order: and first in the region of theological thought. One of the most remarkable of post-war theological phenomena has been the failure of liberalism, represented by Professor Harnack and his school, to keep pace with the times and to meet the needs of the new situation. I once asked a distinguished German theologian how Dr. Harnack now stood in the theological world of Germany. He replied, 'We have dismissed him to Olympus, from which he looks down upon a world that knows him not.' The men to-day who have the ear of the rising generation of theological students are Rudolph Otto, whose book on the *Idea of the Holy* is in its fourteenth edition; Karl Barth, who has written a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which has provoked widespread interest and controversy; Friedrich Heiler, whose treatise on prayer is among the great achievements of modern theology.

Two characteristics of the new theological trend may be noted. First, the theology of immanence is giving way to the theology of transcendence. One of the marks of religious spirits

to-day is the love of the non-rational, the search after the unknown, the craving for the infinite mystery. This is seen in the demand for a type of worship approaching that of Rome, in which symbolism shall have a larger place than it has in traditional Protestantism. In the sphere of thought we see the same tendency at work. Theology now faces its proper task—the solution of the problem of God. The bonds which have hitherto held theology in servitude to science and philosophy must be broken that it may be set free to get face to face with the God of revelation. Hence the newer school, influenced by the great Danish divine Kirkegaard, emphasize the Gospel—that is the Word of God in Christ—as the key to the solution of the riddle of God's relation to the world. Barth, in one of his books, maintains that there is no way from man to God, neither by art, nor science, nor morality, nor religion, but all the more certain is the way from God to man; and this way is Christ. Christ is the releasing and reconciling word which religion does not find: Christ is the solution of the riddle of existence which religion raises with intolerable sharpness. Christ, the revelation of the righteousness of God, continually sought after by religion but never found. In the life and death of Jesus we have a communication by God to man, a communication of God about Himself and His relation to us. Theology has become theocentric. The new theologians criticize the religio-historical method of interpreting Scripture, and demand a spiritual exegesis as alone adequate to the needs of the Christian believer.

The extraordinary variety of theological standpoints may be best seen in three organizations which have a growing and enthusiastic membership. One is the 'Christian Fellowship' under the leadership of Pastor Rittelmeyer, who has over fifty helpers, all University men and many of them former pastors, the best-known being Pauliund Bock. There are branches in twenty-five German towns. Rittelmeyer is under the influence of the anthroposophical teaching of Rudolf Steiner.

Anthroposophy is a form of theosophy. It maintains that by the cultivation of latent spiritual powers we can have direct knowledge of the spiritual world. Vision and miracle are genuine manifestations of the higher spheres into which highly developed personalities can enter. Rittelmeyer says, however, that he is

not concerned to propagate this doctrine. He borrows what he believes to be the best elements in Roman Catholicism in order that a new fellowship of souls may come into existence. Christianity, he holds, as it is at present presented is incapable of satisfying the spiritual aspirations of the age or of assuaging its moral anguish. One of his ruling ideas is that in Christ there is a cosmic force, related to entire nature. Not man only, but the entire universe is redeemed in Christ.

But the Fellowship has a practical aim, not a theoretic one. It seeks to form character, to free men from sin which is conceived rather as a disease than a fault. The power of the Sacraments is emphasized. A view hard to distinguish from Transubstantiation is taught. All are agreed that whatever may be thought of the ideas of Rittelmeyer and his followers, the lives of self-sacrificing devotion which they lead make manifest that they are actuated by love to Christ and to man.

Opposed in many ways to Rittelmeyer's school is that of Johannes Müller, who has no use for occultism in any of its forms. Müller does not wish to form a new sect: rather does he address the tired and discouraged spirits in all the Churches who have not found the comfort and help they needed. He does not profess to preach a new theology. His strength lies in the simplicity with which he seizes the Gospel which ought to govern man's whole existence. Yet he is no ascetic. On the contrary, he encourages music and the dance as arts which have an ethical and social virtue. His proclamation of a Christian life, friendly to innocent enjoyments and based on profound spiritual convictions, is exercising an attractive influence over many of the nobler spirits. There is a constant stream of pilgrims to his retreat in Elman, Bavaria, for purposes of rest and meditation or the re-establishment of spiritual equilibrium. From this home of light and joy radiate influences that affect for good thousands of homes throughout Germany and Scandinavia.

But the most remarkable spiritual movement and the one which may contain within it the seeds of a new Germany is that which goes by the name of the 'Youth Movement.' It has assumed various forms, but these forms, though divergent, have certain features in common. While it appeals to the younger generation in particular, its membership is not exclusively

among the young. It is not a question so much of age as of spirit with the youth movements. In order to understand this movement, to one or other of whose forms the great mass of German youth belongs, we must recall the condition of German schools at the opening of the century. The schools were organized on a highly autocratic basis. The distance between masters and pupils was great, and their relations were consequently marked by suspicion and distrust. The theory of the teachers was that the schools existed for the State, of which the teachers were the representatives. A reaction set in under the leadership of Karl Fischer, who in a school near Berlin gathered his pupils around him and undertook with them frequent excursions on foot into the country. Thus was inaugurated the association known as 'Wandervögel,' or 'migratory birds.' So popular have these excursions now become that just as baseball is the national game of America, 'hiking' may be said to be the national pastime of Germany—with this advantage, that nearly every youth can join in it. The 'Wandervögel' Movement was born in the bosom of youth, and at first was opposed by the authorities who, however, were compelled to yield.

In this movement the inbred romanticism of the German character found expression. The possibility of adventure, journeys by night, the singing of old folk-songs by a camp-fire near the ruins of an ancient castle, the freedom from the restraints of town-life—all these excite the utmost enthusiasm. The movement has developed in different directions. Some groups admit young girls to their excursions; others do not. The great majority forswear the use of tobacco and alcohol. Some declare for pacificism, others for nationalism. But they all emphasize a return to nature, and proclaim a revolt against the artificialities of civilization.

One of the groups which has developed a more consistent idealism is known as the 'Free Germans.' They are the champions of extreme pacificism, and preach the need of reconciliation and international brotherhood. One of their leaders, Paasche, was assassinated in 1920 by the nationalists, and thus their testimony has been sealed with the shedding of innocent blood. In 1923 the Free Germans called a convention, and their principles were summed up in the words of a pastor who addressed them

thus : ' It is anti-religious and anarchic to oppose to the violence of the oppressors the violence of the oppressed. The result of revolution is the same old world of sin and hate. The civil war of the left is followed by that of the right. Consecrate yourselves to the service of what is eternal. Let us obey the living God above us, and united in Him, let us be His servants.' The Free Germans are fired with the sublime ambition of creating a new Germany. The majority of them are either believers in Christianity or friendly to it, a minority swear by Goethe and Fichte.

The Youth Movement has influenced the Churches. Within the Roman Catholic Church young men organized themselves as ' Wandervögel ' with the added idea that for the reform of contemporary society the discipline of the Church is a necessity. Here also are differences in thought and aim. One group is democratic, elects its own chiefs, and maintains that each member can go to the confessor who suits him best ; another group is under strict priestly control.

Within the Protestant Church has been founded an organization called the ' New Work.' The youths who form its membership blame the Churches for their artificiality and officialism. They never tire urging that the essence of religion is the Sermon on the Mount, and they want to see all daily work and life penetrated with the light of the Gospel. For the most part they are Socialists or semi-Socialists. They wish to complete a moral reform of the nation by a social reform, and they are working for a renewal of Germany and Europe on the basis of international reconciliation. Many of the younger pastors are sympathetic with ' New Work ' ideas and are helping them on, and these ideas are identical with those of the ' Free Germans ' but put upon a basis more distinctively and outspokenly Christian. The ' New Work ' asserts that only in the simple teachings of Jesus can a new and better Germany be organized.

In violent contrast to all this, a part of the Youth Movement has devoted itself to ultra-nationalist aims. It is anti-Semitic, anti-Socialistic, opposed to the Treaty of Versailles, anti-Democratic, and pan-German. But this association will lose its power as soon as Germany is fully restored to the comity of nations.

ANGLO-ISRAELISM, CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND THEOSOPHY*

By Professor C. C. J. Webb, Oxford.

IN responding to an invitation to discuss the doctrines of the Anglo-Israelites, Christian Scientists, and Theosophists, I must confess that I have scarcely ever been in company with a believer in any of these creeds, and have thus no intimate acquaintance with them as they reveal themselves in their effects on the minds and lives of those who hold them. I have therefore confined myself in the main to reflections upon the relation which they appear to me respectively to bear to modern thought in general and to historical Christianity; reflections which I offer to consideration with a full consciousness of the facility with which, especially in matters of religion, one may go very far astray in judging of views which one knows only from without, and in no sense from within as expressions of personal experience and principles of personal conduct.

I shall, in what I have to say of Anglo-Israelism, Christian Science, and Theosophy, follow the plan which I now outline. Taking first Anglo-Israelism, then Christian Science, and lastly Theosophy, I shall begin by stating in respect of each in turn what I take to be its main *attraction*; next, what appear to be its relations, in the *first* place to *historical Christianity*, and in the *second* to *contemporary thought* in general; while lastly I shall try to indicate what I should judge to be its fundamental *defect* as an inspiration and guide to religious life.

I. British Israelism.

(1) I take it that we must seek the source of the *attraction* which this theory possesses for a considerable number of people in their very natural desire to link up their own social and political life with one which is dignified by association with a tradition recognized as that of a civilization of world-wide import. It was this desire that inspired in the ancient Romans

* An Address delivered to the Bath Clerical Society, January 12th, 1927.

those attempts to connect the origin of their own imperial State with the legends of the Trojan War whereof the *Aeneid* of Virgil is the enduring monument; and that in mediaeval times gave birth to the fables which, as in the story of the foundation of the British monarchy by Brute the Trojan, derived the nations of northern Europe in their turn from the heroes of the same cycle of legends, and so seemed to give them a share in the venerable traditions of the Roman Empire, whose providential beginnings had been the theme of the great Latin poet. There is nothing strange in the fact that persons accustomed to find in their Bibles—and not accustomed to find elsewhere—the record of a history wherein may be traced a divine purpose for all mankind should take satisfaction in the adoption of a belief which incorporated, as it were, their own national history into this more august and (as they would say) 'sacred' history, with its prophetic promises of a glorious and immortal destiny.

(2) In the belief that our nation is descended from the tribes which, according to the Old Testament, seceded after the death of Solomon from the allegiance of the house of David to found the northern kingdom of Israel there is certainly nothing in itself inconsistent with the Christian faith or with membership of the Christian Church; no more than there is in the acceptance of any other historical hypothesis or ethnological theory. But those who maintain the truth of 'British Israelism' do not, it would appear, regard it as merely such a theory or hypothesis. They conceive of it as carrying with it consequences of *religious* importance. Even so, there is nothing that I know of in these supposed consequences incompatible with the historic creed of Christendom or with membership of the Church that professes that creed. Yet it must be allowed that the assertion of a peculiar privilege to be enjoyed under the Gospel by a particular nation is not congenial to the Pauline principle—a principle which has been incorporated in Catholic tradition—of the absolute equality of the Gentile with the Jew in the new dispensation and of the supersession therein as God's 'chosen People' of 'Israel after the flesh,' a nation whose primary bond was that of *natural* kinship, by a *spiritual* fellowship, recruited by baptism out of all nations alike. It may be added also (although with the proviso that perhaps few of us would be prepared to endorse

in all respects the method of interpreting prophecy which has come down to us from Christian antiquity, and which is embodied in our liturgical use of the Old Testament) that at any rate the retention of the original application of the Old Testament prophecies to 'Israel after the flesh,' a retention which is essential to British Israelism, is wholly alien to the immemorial practice of the Catholic Church, which has ever assumed that, for Christians, the religious significance of the prophetic language about Israel is to be sought in its application to Christ, to the Christian community, or to the individual Christian soul.

(3) But when we pass from considering the relation of British Israelism to historic Christianity to considering its relation to contemporary thought, we shall find that it is here entirely, if I may so express myself, 'out of the picture.' It belongs to a stage of knowledge and of culture to which the principles of ethnological, historical, and philological enquiry, as now understood by scholars, were unknown. For it the observation of superficial resemblances of sound or spelling among names is uncontrolled by any such scientific laws of philological equivalence between sounds in different languages as it is now generally admitted have been ascertained. It may no doubt be said that 'with God all things are possible'; but only by a perpetual recurrence of miraculous interpositions could it have happened, not only that the notoriously various stocks from which this nation has sprung should all derive from a migration of Hebrew captives from the Mesopotamian plains less than three thousand years ago, but that just those Frenchmen should have taken refuge in this island from the persecutions that followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes who were the posterity of these same captives; and just those Englishmen whose blood was traceable to the tribe of Manasseh should have migrated to the Transatlantic continent to form the nucleus of the American nation. Yet I heard a 'British Israel commissioner,' preaching recently in a country church in the Midlands, reckon 'Huguenots' as the last among the groups of descendants of the lost tribes which successively reached Britain, and know that he answered an enquiry about the Americans by the assertion (which I am aware forms part of the usual teaching of his school) that they are the tribe of Manasseh.

Moreover, the whole Anglo-Israelite position is based upon a view of the Biblical writings which no one instructed in the results of the modern investigation of ancient history can possibly accept. Not very long ago the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John, together with certain parts of the Old Testament Apocrypha, stood alone as documents purporting to be prophecies of the last times, using the same kind of phraseology and exhibiting the same general outlook. Did they still so remain, those who desire to accept them at their face-value would still have to reckon with the difficulty of reconciling such acceptance with the view of the world's past history and future prospects to which natural science and historical study have in modern times accustomed us. But, as it is, they do not now so stand alone. We know them to be surviving fragments of a vast apocalyptic literature, much of which has been recovered of late years, and concerning whose origin and connexion, on the one hand with certain oriental mythologies, on the other with the events actually passing when it was composed, we are becoming, through the investigation of scholars such as (to mention English names only) Archdeacon Charles, Professor Burkitt and the present Provost of Eton, every day better informed. The Anglo-Israelite preacher whom, as I said, I heard quite recently, appealed to the book called in our Bibles the 'Second Book of Esdras,' which speaks of the escape of the ten tribes across the Euphrates into another land, as indeed 'apocryphal' and therefore not (according to Article VI) to be used to establish any doctrine, but as nevertheless very likely 'quite good history.' No one who knows anything of the modern study of this book would, however, expect to find it anything of the sort, or would accept the preacher's date of (if I remember right) 400 B.C. for that of its composition. But, even if we could bring ourselves to agree with the preacher in attaching importance to this writing as evidence of historical events taking place long before the Christian era, we should still be far enough from having any ground for accepting his ultimate conclusions. For, according to the author of II *Esdras*, the lost ten tribes, having passed the Euphrates and travelled for a year, found themselves in a land called Arsereth. I am myself no Hebraist, but I gather that this name is held by Hebrew scholars to be explained by the

Hebrew words for 'another land' in *Deut.* xxix, 28. Columbus is said to have thought it must be the new world which he had discovered beyond the Atlantic; but our preacher told us (I cannot think why) that it was Roumania. But, wherever it may have been, the ancient author evidently supposed that there the tribes were to stay until their final restoration to the Holy Land; whereas the preacher informed us that they went 'westward and westward and westward' until they reached this country, of which further migration there is no word said in the passage to which he referred. In fact, these Anglo-Israelite expositors, like others, intepret their texts literally or otherwise just as suits their purpose. As Christians, they cannot suppose the strictly literal meaning of the Old Testament prophecies to be the religiously important one; yet they do not frankly accept a canon of spiritual interpretation, but fall back here and there upon a literalism which they are no more prepared than anyone else to carry out consistently to the end.

(4) From what I have already said, it will probably be clear for what reasons I should not be disposed to seek for religious inspiration and guidance in Anglo-Israelism. It is based upon what it has lately become usual to call, in the language of a notorious controversy among our American cousins, a 'Fundamentalist' view of Scripture, which will shortly, I am convinced, have become as completely untenable by persons of education as the belief in the revolution of the heavens about the earth became in the seventeenth century. So far, again, as the theory has a religious or moral bearing, it is in my opinion calculated to encourage in ourselves a nationalism quite out of keeping with the universal message of the Christian Gospel and a self-complacency diametrically opposed to the temper of humble penitence recommended in the New Testament to all whom God hath concluded under sin, that He might have mercy upon all. The preacher whom I have several times mentioned expounded the nation (a *nation*, as he insisted, not a *Church*) 'bringing forth the fruits' of the Kingdom of God, to which in the parable of the Vineyard the kingdom is to be transferred from the unworthy Jews, to mean the British nation; and he dwelt upon our missionary activities as confirming this interpretation. But the last thing that we now need, as it seems to me,

is anything which, like this teaching, tends to obscure the essentially international character of Catholic Christianity and may readily be made to minister to national self-righteousness or to belief in a prerogative divine mission peculiar to our own people; a belief, it must be emphasized, which is quite clearly to be distinguished from belief in a special contribution which our own nation is no doubt called upon to make, as other nations are called upon to make their no less special contributions, to the building up of God's spiritual city.

II. Christian Science.

(1) The attraction of Christian Science is not hard to discover. There are many over whose minds the problem of the pervading presence of evil—nay, of the presence of evil at all in a world made and governed by a perfectly good, all-wise and all-powerful God—broods like a recurrent nightmare. There are yet more who find their own way to happiness continually barred by ill-health or misfortune; there are perhaps few whose enjoyment of life is not frequently interrupted by distasteful circumstances over which (as is commonly supposed) they have no control. To such may come as a gospel of liberation and healing the suggestion that by the simple method of resolutely denying the reality of the obstacles to happiness of pain and poverty, of sin and sorrow, of sickness and death, we may cease to find them blocking our path; and that we are not called upon to make this valiant denial each by himself, where our courage might fail in bidding a solitary defiance to a gigantic foe, but with the support of a widespread and powerful organization claiming for itself, on grounds which to some people may be made to sound plausible, a better right than any of its rivals can show to the august names of *Christianity* and *Science*. For the sacred books of Christianity unquestionably suggest that the healing of bodily disease without the intervention of such material means as the medical profession employs was a characteristic feature of its first preaching: while talk about Spirit being the sole reality, about what has been called *supernatural* being in fact *natural* in the eyes of those with an adequate conception of Nature, about the power of mental concentration to control the life of sense, is sufficiently like much that may be

found in the writings of idealistic philosophers and of scientific psychologists to recommend the claim that we have to do here with no traditional superstition, surviving from the Middle Ages and out of harmony with the modern world, but with a view essentially akin to much that is stirring in the intellectual world of to-day. Thus it is not, I think, wonderful that Christian Science should possess an attraction for some of our contemporaries, or even that it should be able to point to manifest fruits in the lives of adherents to whom it has succeeded in imparting a serenity and a confidence, a freedom from worry about matters of health and petty troubles of life, which they did not possess before they adopted this religion.

(2) It needs care to describe accurately the relation of Christian Science to historical Christianity. It was certainly the intention of its foundress to put it forward as the genuine development of the Christian religion. It calls itself Christian, and in its claim actually to possess the power of healing without such material means as the medical profession considers to be indispensable, it exhibits a specious resemblance to the most primitive Christianity in a respect wherein the religion of the greater part of Christendom has been content not to resemble it; for the Roman Catholic Church, although it denies that miracles of healing have ever altogether ceased in the Church, does not pretend to perform such miracles as a regular part of its evangelistic work. Christian Science has moreover retained from historic Christianity the acceptance of the Bible as an inspired and sacred volume, though, by placing alongside of it as an inspired and sacred commentary Mrs. Eddy's *Science and Health*, it has given it, so to say, a partner in the sovereignty which it had previously enjoyed alone. To those who have been accustomed, as many Protestants are accustomed, to identify Christianity with acceptance of the Bible, the right of Christian Science to be considered Christian may be considered on this account irrefragable; and if, on closer inspection, it be found that the acceptance of the Bible by Christian Scientists is not undiscriminating, the same is practically the case with all other bodies that claim the Christian name to-day; probably, in fact if not in word, even with those who would call themselves Fundamentalists; though no doubt with some the exercise of discrimi-

nation is less conscious than with others. But the divergences of Christian Science from historic Christianity are nevertheless very considerable. Even the spiritual healing which it performs does not appear to be attributed, so far as the *modus operandi* is concerned, to the 'prayer of faith' which the New Testament regards as the effective cause of such cures. Although *Science and Health* certainly affirms the divinity of Christ and speaks of 'adoring' Jesus; contains a chapter on 'Atonement and Eucharist'; appeals to Christians to ask themselves whether they are drinking their Master's cup and sharing 'the blood of the New Covenant, the sufferings and persecutions which attend a new and higher understanding of God'; and even speaks in one place of the Cross as 'the central symbol of history'; yet on all these subjects the teaching of Mrs. Eddy does not follow Christian tradition so closely as some of her language might suggest. She distinguishes the divine 'Christ' from 'Jesus' very much after the fashion of the early Gnostics, and her account of our Lord's passion and death is, like theirs, docetic. Nor could it well be otherwise; for she holds that all suffering and death are unreal, and that it was precisely in knowing and revealing this, and by proving through His resurrection the unreality of His own death, that Christ became the inaugurator of the true religion. 'The Man of Sorrows,' she has elsewhere written, 'knew that the Man of Joys, his invisible self, was the Son of God, and the mortal mind, not the Immortal Mind, suffered'; 'mortal mind' being always, we must remember, in the phraseology of Christian Science, a source of baneful illusion. She could declare (not, it is true, in *Science and Health*) that 'had wisdom characterized all the sayings of Jesus, he would not have prophesied his own death, and thereby hastened or caused it'; and it is significant that in her *Church Manual* she was constrained, presumably by the appearance among her followers of a tendency to take up toward our Lord an attitude very different from any that has ever commended itself to Christians, to declare that 'careless comparison or irreverent reference to Christ Jesus is abnormal in a Christian Scientist, and prohibited.' The celebration of the Eucharist was in 1908 laid aside in the Mother-Church at Boston. This is not surprising, since (though this was not the reason assigned for that step) it was instituted on

what is described in *Science and Health* as a 'mournful occasion' which, though we are told that it 'closed for ever Jesus' ritualism or concessions to matter,' was plainly itself one, although the last, of such concessions. Moreover, Christian Science teaches that, as to sin, disease, and death, 'the less said or thought of them the better'; words which echo indeed a celebrated saying of Spinoza's, but are plainly out of harmony with the regular repetition of a rite designed to 'show forth the Lord's death till he come.' And on the whole there is a great contrast in temper between Christian Science and historic Christianity, which announces indeed that 'death is swallowed up in victory' but is very far from minimizing the significance of that victory by a denial of the reality of the 'last enemy to be overcome'; and which has presented to us the Pattern Sufferer as not, like a Stoic sage, treating the cup of suffering with contempt, still less as denying its reality, like a Christian Scientist, but as praying in an agony that it might pass from him. For Christian Science, again, poverty, we are told, is an error, like sin, sickness, and death; historic Christianity, on the other hand, has seen in poverty a counsel of perfection which not a few are called to embrace; in sickness a spiritual opportunity, in death a gateway of life; and in the utterance of its deepest thought has not even shrunk from exclaiming of the archetypal sin, *O felix culpa quae talem et tantum meruit habere Redemptorem.* Certainly Christian Science is not merely distinct from historical Christianity—it is of a different spirit altogether; while, so far as the institutional side of the Christian religion is concerned, it is notorious that Christian Science offers to its converts as a spiritual home a new society, quite distinct from any which claims to be or to belong to the Catholic Church of Christ; a society membership in which is, I suppose, admittedly inconsistent with simultaneous membership of any other religious body.

(3) When we ask ourselves what is the relation of Christian Science to contemporary thought in general, we have to note once more its use of the word 'Science' to describe itself. Unquestionably this use is intended to suggest a claim to be guided neither by authority nor by emotion, but by reason. Such a claim is calculated to appeal to many who, although without any

systematic training in science or philosophy, are influenced by the feeling that full confidence can only be given to teaching which claims, like Natural Science, to rest on grounds accessible to all and amenable to experimental tests. Along with that feeling there often goes a preference for views which represent the divine as 'immanent' in the world of everyday experience rather than as controlling it or interfering with it from without. It is significant that Mrs. Eddy tells us in *Science and Health* that God's healing of Jesus after his apparent death upon the cross 'was a method of surgery beyond material art; but it was not a supernatural act; it was a divinely natural act.' Moreover, while I am not disposed to think that a clear and consistent metaphysic can be extracted from Mrs. Eddy's writings, there is a certain general resemblance in the doctrine therein set forth to views which possess high philosophic authority and also to opinions held by some men of science which are exciting at the present moment much public interest and curiosity; a resemblance fully sufficient to impress persons unaccustomed to exactitude and careful discrimination in such matters. Many philosophers have contended that we cannot conceive the material world to exist otherwise than as an object to some mind; others that no really existent thing is evil in itself, but only when misplaced or misused; and such views are echoed, confusedly enough, in the teachings of Christian Science. A severe critic of Mrs. Eddy, the late Mr. Stephen Paget, has said, not without much justification, that 'rags of Plato and Aristotle, the Schoolmen, Spinoza, Berkeley and the Evangelists dance in her mind and she writes it all down like a *planchette*.' Again, various forms of what is called psychotherapy have been of late practised with conspicuous success, especially among the numerous fighting men who were, as the phrase goes, 'shell-shocked' in the Great War. A 'new psychology,' as it has been called, has arisen, based on the theories of a man of genius, Sigmund Freud, and developed in various ways by his disciples and critics, which, for reasons which are not far to seek, has greatly interested the general public; and a man of remarkably attractive personality, the late M. Coué, devoted himself to preaching, with no design of pecuniary profit for himself, a peculiar technique of what is nowadays called 'auto-suggestion,' whereby persons suffering from

ill-health might cure themselves by the method of perpetually suggesting to themselves that every day and in every way they were getting better and better. We must not forget that Christian Science was in the field before any of these recent developments, theoretical or practical, of the science and art of mental healing; so that we cannot see in it a reflection of these. But I have mentioned them, and the attention which they have aroused, in order to illustrate the point that, so far as the general idea of healing by means of the mind is concerned, Christian Science claims to do what conspicuous representatives of the medical and psychological science of the day are also endeavouring to do, in ways which to an uncritical observer look not very dissimilar—to 'minister to a mind diseased' by working upon it, not through treatment of the bodily organism, but through the *rapport* of mind with mind. In thus ministering Christian Science claims to use the only genuinely Christian method. 'It demands,' says its exponent in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 'the entire surrender of the human will to the Divine (*Luke* ix, 23). Thus it is the exact opposite of mesmerism and hypnotism, and has nothing in common with theosophy, spiritualism, occultism, higher thought, mental suggestion and mental science.' But it is, as we have seen, extremely doubtful whether the conception of the divine will entertained by Christian Science is at all coincident with that which we owe to the teaching of the New Testament and of the Christian Church. Readers of the *Confessions* of St. Augustine will, I think, be struck by a resemblance between the position of Christian Science in the religious world of to-day and that of Manicheanism in the religious world of his. The two systems are not at all alike in their doctrine; but Manicheanism, like Christian Science, attracted adherents largely by its claim to be more scientific and to open up to its followers a profounder and fuller knowledge of the universe than the creed of Catholic Christendom; while, by the very fact of carrying with it a special philosophy and science of its own, it came into direct conflict with the genuine science of its time; so that Augustine worked his way out of it by the help of his secular learning, with which he found it impossible to reconcile the dogmas of his Manichean teachers.

(4) Thus in Christian Science we shall not find any religious inspiration and guidance unless we are prepared, as thinkers, to deny altogether the reality of that great part of our experience which we call experience of the material world, of pain, and of sin, and to refuse to consider the problem which this experience raises further than by attributing it to an illusion caused by *Mortal Mind*—an entity of which we may venture to say that no intelligible account is offered, and the very existence of which seems to be incompatible with the first principles of Christian Science itself; and unless we are also prepared, as Christians, to discard as irreligious, as harmful, the belief, so eminently characteristic of historical Christianity, that there is no season and no place so favourable for the improvement of the soul's acquaintance with God as the time of adversity and the foot of the Cross of Jesus Christ.

III. Theosophy.

I turn lastly to Theosophy, meaning here by this word the teaching of the Theosophical Society, founded originally by Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, and now represented by that remarkable woman, Mrs. Annie Besant.

(1) The peculiar attraction of this teaching lies, I think, in its pretension to explain all the mutually conflicting religions of the world as alternative exoteric forms of a single esoteric tradition, handed down by a mysterious brotherhood of adepts from the earliest ages, and promulgated from time to time under veils of symbolism which at once conceal from the unfit and reveal to the initiated the truth which it is desirable to impart to those spiritually and intellectually qualified to receive it. Many passions of human nature, some among the noblest, some among the least noble, find their account here. The aspiration of reason after an all-inclusive synthesis—and the self-satisfaction of the initiate in belonging to a spiritual aristocracy; the high ambition to break down the walls of division which sever race from race and creed from creed, and to embrace all men with a charity that 'believeth all things, hopeth all things'—and the moral indolence which shrinks from clear discrimination between right and wrong, true and false, and from such definite adherence to one side in a controversy as may in the end involve the martyr's

resistance into blood; the sentiment of compassion and kindness for all living beings—and the undisciplined revulsion from the convictions in which one has been bred, which may lead sometimes to a strange tolerance of cruel or unclean practices, where these have the glamour attaching to what is alien and exotic; the love, deeply engrained in many imaginative souls, of the wonderful and mysterious—and the amateur's impatience of the cautious and humble temper, the slow and laborious methods, the acquiescence for the time being in doubt and uncertainty, which are the notes of genuine scholarship and science. To all these does Theosophy appeal, and there is therefore nothing surprising in the wide diffusion of its influence. It must, moreover, be borne in mind that in India it has allied itself with the political aspirations of the Hindu community, and has played a part (by no means wholly to be regretted) in stimulating and encouraging among members of that community an interest in the treasures of religious devotion and philosophical speculation which are contained in their ancient literature and tradition.

(2) Of the creeds which I discussed previously, British Israelism presupposes Christianity as its background, and Christian Science claims to be a new interpretation of Christianity; but Theosophy definitely and professedly disclaims the Christian name; though it reckons Christianity, like the other great historical religions, among the forms under which the one true religion has been promulgated from time to time by the Masters who guard the sacred tradition; sees in Christ himself one of the great Teachers who have been the appointed instruments of such promulgation; and, with the eclecticism characteristic of its whole attitude, is quite ready to incorporate Christian elements into its system. So long, then, as Christianity maintains its claim to be itself the one true and final religion, and affirms that the Name of Jesus is 'the only name given under heaven whereby men may be saved,' or that 'other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, even Jesus Christ,' so long Christianity cannot come to terms with Theosophy, although Theosophy can easily find a place for Christianity within its own synthesis on condition of Christianity abating its *exclusive* pretensions and consenting to recognize its rivals as *alternatives* to itself. Now, I do not think that Christianity can, without

self-stultification, accept the position of a mere *alternative*; its exclusive claim is of its essence. Yet, without such an abandonment of this exclusive claim as would change it into something quite other than it has always been, it may, and in my judgment must, admit a view of other religions different from that which Christians have most often taken in the past. The great extension in recent times of our knowledge of other religions than our own, and the influence of the idea of evolution or development which during the nineteenth century became the ruling idea in European thought, have rendered it far more difficult for us than it was for our fathers to acquiesce in a sharp distinction of Christianity, together with its parent, the religion of Israel, from all other faiths as the one wholly true from the many false, the one divinely revealed from the many humanly imagined; and in the acknowledgment in these others of, at the very most, no more than shadows and anticipations of a truth elsewhere fully disclosed; or, perhaps, relics of a primitive revelation preserved in its purity by the seed of Abraham alone; but never a contribution to our knowledge of God without which our own religion could not be made perfect. Thus in modern theology, and even in the best missionary thought of the present day, we find a changed attitude on the part of convinced and earnest Christians toward other faiths which I, for my own part, unreservedly welcome. The problem of reconciling this change of attitude with loyalty to the distinctive claims of the Christian Gospel is one which I can here only indicate and not discuss. But I may perhaps be allowed to refer to an essay contributed by myself to a volume lately published under the title *Science, Religion and Reality*. In this essay I have endeavoured to suggest that the unity of modern civilization demands a universal religion, and that two different conceptions of what a universal religion should be are offered to us by two of the great historical religions of the world, Hinduism and Christianity respectively; conceptions which differ mainly in the ignoring by the one and the recognition by the other of the spiritual significance of *history*. The so-called Theosophy which is the subject of our discussion at the moment embodies in its tale of a single secret tradition, unverifiable and fanciful as this tale may be, this notion of a divine revelation as something unaffected by historical development,

always the same, and only variously illustrated or more or less imperfectly adumbrated by the different historical systems of religion which from time to time have appeared in the world. In its earlier days what is now called Theosophy was known as Esoteric Buddhism, and it has always sought its chief inspiration in the group of religions to which India has given birth; in the later stages of its career it has been in closer contact with Hinduism as it now exists in India itself than with any other of the great historic faiths. The scheme of redemption presented in the traditional theology of Christendom, though it too must be admitted in the light of modern knowledge to contain elements of an unverifiable and mythical character, embodies on the other hand the notion of God revealing himself in and through the actual process of the world's history. The prerogative place of the religion of Israel among the national faiths which preceded the appearance of the great systems which claim to have a message for the whole world, such as Buddhism, Christianity and Islam, is not to be found in the fact that its sacred legends, and they alone, can be historically verified, its ceremonies and laws, and they alone, can exhibit satisfactory proofs of divine institution; but in the fact that, as St. Athanasius said, Israel has been the 'school of the knowledge of God to all nations'; that it has occupied in the historical line of the world's religious development a position analogous to that which Greece has occupied in that of its scientific, and Rome in that of its political development. The desire, instead of seeing in all but one or two of the religions of the world a mere mass of error, to find in them all a single yet manifold self-revelation of God is legitimate, and the attraction which Theosophy possesses for many people is due to it seeming to satisfy this desire. It satisfies it, however, in a fashion which, in accordance with the tradition of Indian religion, fails to give its due significance to history. To Christianity history has always been profoundly significant, and I believe it to be possible to develop on genuinely Christian lines a view no less capable of satisfying the legitimate desire of which I have just spoken, while, by assigning to Christianity that central position in the world's religious development which I think it will actually be found on inspection to occupy, it justifies that claim to an unique and unsharable pre-eminence

which we have seen to be part of its message to mankind. It is also to be observed, before we leave the consideration of the relation of Theosophy to historic Christianity, that Theosophy has adopted the doctrine by which Hinduism and Buddism alike have attempted to account for the mysteries of suffering. This is the doctrine of *Karma*, which affirms an exact equivalence between the good and evil deeds performed in each of a series of existences, every one of which depends upon its predecessor, and the good and evil consequences which are entailed thereby in those which come after. This doctrine of Karma is one for which much may be said; and, if it be criticized as lacking empirical verification, the same may be said of the Christian belief in the sovereignty of Divine Goodness. On the other hand, it is not only extremely hard to reconcile it with such a recognition of psychical heredity through physical descent as the facts seem to force upon us; but it is also directly opposed to the great Christian doctrine of the Forgiveness of Sins, which, in all the phases through which our religion has passed or is passing, has been acknowledged to lie at the very heart of the Gospel which that religion professes to bring to mankind.

(3) Theosophy has, like the ancient Gnosticism to which it presents so many resemblances, shown a wide hospitality to notions derived from contemporary philosophy and science; but, professing as it does to reveal a system not only of religious but of natural and metaphysical knowledge with a resultant control of natural forces, already in the secure possession of the mysterious sages of the East, and superior to that hitherto attained by the exoteric philosophy and science of Western civilization, it obviously makes a claim which that philosophy and science cannot admit without abandoning altogether the lines upon which they have so far moved, and orientating themselves afresh in a direction from which they have during many centuries been continually diverging.

(4) Thus to look for religious inspiration and guidance to Theosophy would for a Christian and an inheritor of the traditions of European civilization be to turn his back upon the religious and scientific principles which have so far guided the course of that civilization and revert to a way of regarding the

world which his predecessors have for a long time past been gradually abandoning. It is of course possible to argue that in so doing he would be returning from the ways of error into the path of sound reason; but there is no space now at our disposal adequate to the discussion of so fundamental a matter. It must suffice to indicate the revolutionary character of the invitation which Theosophy extends to us. For it is sometimes presented as though it asked of us nothing but that we should enlarge our sympathies and see the beliefs which we already hold as parts of a larger whole or as symbols of a deeper truth. Moreover, as students of the history of this Theosophy will be aware, high as is the personal character of some of its representatives, yet, as a system, the ready hospitality which it accords on principle to all religious systems inevitably involves a reluctance to condemn whole-heartedly in all cases ideas and practices quite alien to the standards which commend themselves to the Christian conscience. The intolerance with which historical Christianity has often been charged has not infrequently been to a considerable degree motived by the perception that the doctrines which it condemned led to consequences incongruous with its own ethical standards. Unlovely as this intolerance has frequently been, abominable as have sometimes been the results of its practical application, there is yet a real danger that, in an impetuous haste to cast it aside, we may find ourselves untrue, not merely to a dogmatic tradition, venerable indeed for its associations yet perhaps not meaning much to ourselves, but to moral principles which we should be horrified to find ourselves doubting, much less conceiving it possible to reconsider.

In conclusion, I feel sure that, in the case of the three doctrines we have been discussing, as in that of any others which we may come across, we should always meet them first with the best attempt that we can make at a sympathetic understanding of their point of view, and then, if it seem to us that they are mistaken, by the positive development of that portion or aspect of truth with which they appear to us to be inconsistent. Thus study of the agreed results of Biblical criticism conducted on the lines of the best modern scholarship will leave Anglo-Israelism without the presuppositions and atmosphere in which alone it can live; while it will deepen our sense of the solidarity of our

own social and religious life with that of humanity at large under the universal providence of God, and so satisfy the legitimate aspirations which Anglo-Israelism arose to meet. A like study of the history of religion in general and of Christianity in particular will be at any rate unlikely to encourage the kind of mentality to which Theosophy makes its appeal; while it will strengthen that faith in the universality of divine revelation which Theosophy has rightly sought to uphold. As to Christian Science, it is probably familiarity with the classic literature of Christian devotion that will at once brace the spirit, as Christian Science has aimed at bracing it, to rise superior to the troubles of life in the strength of faith in the sovereign love of God, and will lift it into a region wherein the ideals of Christian Science will themselves seem cheap and thin in comparison with those of the Saints whose religion found its centre of worship and the secret of its power in the revelation of that love upon the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.

THE PRAYER BOOK IN PARISH CHURCHES

By Rev. Bernard M. Hancock, Rector of Bishopstoke, Hants.

AMIDST all the controversy about the new Prayer Book, practically no stress has been laid upon the fact that all our churches are parish churches, provided solely for the parishioners of each parish. Congregationalism is contrary to the principles of the Church of England. This fact must be kept in mind in any revision of the Book of Common Prayer. It is the bearing of these facts on the 'party' system which has grown up within the Church of England which needs serious consideration.

What either the English language or the English character would have been without Shakespeare, the Authorised Version of the Bible, and the Book of Common Prayer, it would be a difficult thing to surmise.

Since 1662 the Book of Common Prayer has not been 'revised.' But the 1662 Book was the result of a series of Prayer

Book 'Revisions,' which began in 1534 and lasted for 128 years. Every English Prayer Book has been a 'Revision' of some form to which the English people had become accustomed. But in every 'Revision' not only was old matter omitted, but new matter was introduced. Every 'Revision' was the occasion of bitter, and once at least of bloody, opposition. Those who gave us the 1662 Book had to face just the same kind of difficulty we have to face to-day. Then, as now, the bishops were accused of using underhand methods to destroy the 'Protestant' character of the Church of England; then, as now, there was an attempt made, by compromise, to retain all within the Church of England. The former attempts were not wholly successful in this matter. There were recusants and dissenters, but *there was no idea of remaining in the Church of England and claiming the right to disobey the Book of Common Prayer.*

I.

If the 1927 'Revision' is to advance the cause of true religion, we must, first of all, be quite clear as to what is the goal of the religion that looks to Jesus of Nazareth. It is so fatally easy to make means into ends, and so miss the one and only end God has planned.

The Prayer Book makes it abundantly clear that the one ambition of every bishop, of every curate, of every lay person should be 'truly to please' God. Only if all strive to please God, can God's purpose for mankind be attained.

To attempt to produce a book which will please factions within the Church, is to court failure. 'Faction' is a symptom of 'Egoism.' There is a type of religiosity which develops 'egoism.' St. Paul condemned it at Corinth, because it led to men claiming to belong to the Cephas party, the Apollos party, the Paul party, and the Christ party. We are not told if each 'party' had its own organization. These parties are with us still. The Cephas party of to-day is the 'Anglo-Catholic'; the Paul party is the boast of the Evangelical; the Modernist with his stress on the intellect, represents the old Apollos party, and the no-party-party man would find himself in sympathy with those who boasted that they were 'of Christ.'

If each of us, no matter if our temperament attracts us specially to the traditional, the intellectual, or the mystical side of the Christian religion, would make it our passion to please God by co-operating with Him to attain the one and only 'end' of our holy religion—'Fellowship with the living God and fellowship with the folk God in His providence brings us into contact with, as we journey along the path of life, which is our vocation'—then we shall be in a position rightly to revise our Book of Common Prayer.

Once we are clear about the purposed object of the Christian religion—'The Double Fellowship,' which the 1920 Lambeth Conference told us is the secret of life: 'The secret of life is the Double Fellowship'; once we realize that we have to accept, and not choose our 'neighbour,' which is the point of the parable of the Good Samaritan, then the only duty of the bishops, of the Convocations, of the National Assembly, of the two houses of Parliament, is to give us a Prayer Book which will eliminate 'Party' churches, and which will make every 'Parish' church God's House of Prayer for all the churchfolk for whom it has been provided. In short, according to the present legal organization of the parochial system, all parishioners should worship in their own parish church.

Just because all in any parish are not of the same temperament, class, or outlook, their fellowship through Christ with one another will enable each to grasp fuller truth, and become a more complete 'person,' than if they had deserted their parish church for some cave-of-Adullam-Party church, which must of necessity increase 'party' faction.

> 'The thorough partisan,' writes Canon Maynard Smith, 'ceases to be free; he does not exercise his own judgment; he sells himself and his reason to insure the triumph of his party. He invents arguments to prove his party right; he no longer follows the truth, whither it leads. He is proud of his loyalty and glories in it; he has ceased to blush when he lies against the truth. In fact he ceases to believe that his party can be wrong; he will acknowledge no fact that makes against its interest. And yet how much craft, cleverness, adroitness, diplomacy, and skill go to insure a party triumph.'

II.

If we would eliminate 'party' churches, and restore all parishioners to their own parish church, because it is the church

and fellowship God has provided for their development and work, then our Prayer Book must not be a 'party' book, but must combine all that is true in the Anglo-Catholic, the Modernist, and the Evangelical outlook. We do not want 'Toleration' of other people's errors, but we do want to co-ordinate every aspect of truth that others have come to realize. No honest seeker after truth will 'tolerate' truths held by others, he will embrace them and fit them in with whatever aspects of truth he already grasps. This will, of course, involve effort and adjustment.

Before we can make any useful approach to bring about corporate unity with 'Geneva,' 'Constantinople,' and 'Rome,' we must attain unity among ourselves in each parish. For here we shall have, what our Lord designed in choosing His twelve apostles, just the right combination to balance the traditional, the intellectual, the mystical aspect of the Gospel.

When in each parish there is a Christian fellowship, then the deanery will become a Christian fellowship; when each deanery has become a Christian fellowship, then the diocese will become a Christian fellowship; from the diocese we can pass to the whole country, and from the country to the nations of the world, and the attainment in practical life in all its relationships of the greatest revolutionary slogan in the world, 'There is one God and Father of all.' The more we widen our fellowship, the fuller will be our grasp of all truth.

The ideal unity of the Church of England can only be attained by the co-ordination and fellowship in each parish of the Anglo-Catholic, the Modernist, and the Evangelical. But to attain this each seeker after truth must himself be an Anglo-Catholic, a Modernist, and an Evangelical. He must respect tradition, he must at all costs follow after new truths, and he must strive to attain the mystical experience of God.

> 'There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
> On such a full sea are we now afloat;
> And we must take the current when it serves,
> Or lose our ventures.'

THE CONCEPTION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

By Rev. Gerald Herring, M.A., Rector of Pilgrim's Rest, Transvaal.

IT may be remembered that some years ago Mr. Clutton Brock[1] wrote an imaginative account of the Temptation. Satan is depicted as trying to persuade Our Lord to abandon His teaching:

> 'This Kingdom of Heaven of Yours,' he says . . . 'They will never understand that. It is You men will be interested in. Men will be prepared to worship You, to pray to You. Yes, they will make Creeds and Dogmas about You. They will build temples to You. They will offer You endless prayers. They will call You GOD. Why not be content?
>
> Oh, they will listen to You; they will hang on Your words . . . But they will not understand what You say . . . This Kingdom of Heaven of Yours . . . No, they will never understand that.'

And yet it was the conception of the Kingdom of Heaven which held Jesus Christ above all else. It haunted Him. The phrase occurs in the First Gospel alone some thirty-two times. It was without doubt the very centre and core of Christ's teaching. Parable is piled on parable in vain attempt to make it clear to His somewhat obtuse disciples.

By the Kingdom of Heaven Christ judged men. Just in so far as a man's life and outlook was energized by love, hope, and faith, so far did he approach the Kingdom: or, on the other hand, was reckoned as far from it. Among Christ's last commissions was the sending of His men definitely to 'preach the Kingdom of God.'

But is it not almost true to say that with the ending of Christ's earthly life there ended also any vital, dynamic, conception of the Kingdom? If an inquirer, after studying the Gospels, were to go and look for it in the official Prayer Book, would he find anything about it? He would, of course, turn at once to the Creeds. There he would find Heaven a place quite distinct

[1] I am indebted to the writings of Arthur Clutton Brock for many of the ideas in this paper. His Temptation Narrative will be found in *Essays on Life*.

from earth. Concerning, however, Christ's central conception, the Kingdom of Heaven, he would find nothing at all.[2]

He would learn nothing about that Kingdom which could be found like a treasure in a field, which could grow in men's hearts like a seed. And even if it is mentioned in the Catechism it seems to be nothing like Our Lord's conception. As for the XXXIX Articles (which were intended to settle all disputes), it would appear from a perusal of them, as Brock acutely points out, that neither the Church nor the Heretics found the Kingdom at all interesting.

The early Christians seem to have conceived it as something to be produced by a cataclysm, or a series of them, such as we see depicted in the *Book of the Revelation.* When that failed to occur, the Kingdom became a place or state of being distinct from this world. The early Christians just projected it into the future by a mechanism of compensation. I think the persistence of this idea of theirs (which keeps cropping up) is a real weakness in religious thought to-day. Satan's prophecy of *an eternal misunderstanding* would seem to have been only too correct.

It is, to my mind, quite useless to criticize any branch of New Thought in the light of Christian Faith unless we are first clear about the central teaching of Jesus Christ. If we have not this criterion we shall fail hopelessly in estimating the value of any new knowledge. Christ's values, attitude, and outlook are all important, and I believe if the doctrine of Ultimate Values had been popularized, instead of being frowned on by the ecclesiastically-minded, our people would to-day be in possession of true spiritual criteria. They would not flounder so much, and get so hopelessly out of their depth, in the tide of new knowledge which is coming in like a flood.[3]

[2] It would appear that, through mental inertia, the phantasy 'Kingdom of Heaven,' which is *legitimate phantasy,* i.e. creative, dynamic, inspiratory, and capable of being brought to reality, has been dropped in favour of 'Heaven,' which is not so much dynamic as static.

[3] In *The Ultimate Belief* (a study in Values) Brock writes: 'I meant (this book) for teachers. My object was to state very simply certain beliefs about the nature of man and of the universe, which, it seems to me, children ought to be taught so that their minds may be *protected against sophistries old and new.*'

Now in trying to solve the real meaning of the Kingdom—'this celestial *x*,' as it has been called—I would first submit that it means Harmony. And I would say that this conception of the Kingdom as a Harmony, deep and wide, needs to-day especially to be emphasized.

In the second place, I submit that a man enters this Kingdom of Harmony here and now just in so far as he enters into the mind and purposes of God, and just in so far as his instincts and emotions are knit up together in a loyalty to the Divine Scheme. It means, then, either for individual or nation, the entrance here and now, into that 'world of invisible laws by which God is ruling and blessing His people.'[4] (This is, by the way, Hort's definition of the Kingdom and quoted with approval by Sanday.)

There is no doubt that the world is crying out for the Kingdom of Heaven. But if it conceives that Kingdom as projected to an indefinite future, the world will stop its crying, for it will see that it is like a child crying for the moon.

The individual is not satisfied. Although he may not (as Shaw says) be 'worrying about his sins,' he is, to quote W. R. Matthews,

> 'worrying about his complexes. He is in search of the same kind of deliverance as that which his predecessors were pursuing . . . the inner peace that can come only by a resolution of conflict, and the unification of the self round a satisfying object of love and loyalty . .'[5]

and I would add that a man gets this deliverance as he is enabled to attain those adjusted relationships to Self, Man, and God which the Kingdom of Heaven implies in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The idea of entering the Kingdom as a present potentiality is well brought out in Luke's parable of the Great Supper. We see this conception of the Kingdom in such parables as the Merchantman seeking Goodly Pearls, the Leaven hid in Three Measures of Meal, and the Mustard Seed. We see it also in the Lord's Prayer, where 'Thy Kingdom come' is equivalent to 'Thy Will be done on earth.'

With these thoughts in mind I do not feel altogether in sympathy with the idea that Christianity is fundamentally a Pilgrim-

[4] Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 79.

[5] W. R. Matthews, *The Gospel and the Modern Mind*, p. 37

or Interims-Ethic. Such an idea began, I imagine, among those who believed that a speedy end of the world was imminent. It is an ethic which had, and has, behind it an ulterior motive, the renunciation of the joy and beauty of this life for the sake of 'salvation' in the next.

I do not think that 'interims-ethic' appeals to happy or harmonized people. It is rather to be found among those who incline (unconsciously, perhaps) to despair of this present world. The thwarted, or those who have failed to assimilate the sorrow of bereavement: people still in a state of conflict who incline to say 'No' to Life. Such are likely to see the Universe as a temptation, a mirage, a deception. They incline to project the Kingdom into the future by the exercise of an unconscious mechanism of compensation.

Actually, too, appears *the wish* to view the world in this way. This is seen in the acutely ego-centric who only want to use this world as a stepping-stone to heavenly joys hereafter. Hence this world becomes to such nothing but a weary and uncomfortable waiting-room into which it is not worth while, indeed foolish, to put too many pictures or adornments. Meanwhile, as we sit on the uncomfortable chairs, we begin to wish we had never left our mothers. We begin to have regressive cravings and to long for somebody's 'bosom.' All this is very well seen as the *motif* of the interims-ethic hymn, of which the refrain is mostly: 'O Paradise, O Paradise, 'tis weary waiting here.'[7]

And then, quite logically, a vast number of mediaeval saints, whose fear of the world, the flesh, and the devil ran to abnormal limits, seem deliberately to have made the interim intolerable. Many of them turned the waiting-room of this world into a torture-chamber. They put pins into the chairs and tacks into the carpet, lest from pure weariness of waiting they should slumber and sleep. Having projected the Kingdom into the future, they yet failed to see that their best chance of ever enter-

[6] (Christ) . . . 'has not refused even the Kingdom of this world, but has transcended it, turning from jewels to flowers like a child' (Brock).

[7] This *egoistic idea* is seen in the *Priest's Book of Private Devotion* (much used to-day). 'Break, I beseech Thee, the chains which bind me to the world. Teach me to look down upon its splendour, to despise . . . all things it holds out to us; to count them but dung that I may win Christ' (!) (p. 368).

ing it truly lay in improving the present. Even if the Kingdom had suddenly arrived they had been better found by their Lord beautifying the waiting-room and hanging up some pictures. (Putting the nails into the walls, in fact, instead of into themselves.)

The Eremites, the desert dwellers, show well to what extremes the pilgrim-ethic tends. The picture of Macarius[8] standing in a swamp to be bitten by mosquitoes 'until he looked like a leper' is only a little less revolting than that of St. Christine de St. Troud,[9] who 'laid herself in the hot oven, fastened herself to the wheel, had herself racked on the wheel, hung on the gallows beside a corpse, buried herself in the grave,' etc.

It may sound challenging, but I believe St. Paul is, in some respects, responsible for this tendency to masochism. His interim-view seems so often to over-ride any dynamic of the Kingdom. Hence an element of self-torture and despair of the world. He is among those whose main hope is in the hereafter, in the heavenly promises. He is sure there is a 'crown laid up.' He 'dies daily.' With a curious impatience he longs to be with Christ, and he is far from gentle to his body. With regard to it he uses the word ὑπωπιάζω[10] which means, I believe, 'to beat black and blue.'

Splendid and glorious for the world as his sublimation was, I yet would venture the suggestion that if, by analysis, St. Paul had ever been able to face himself completely, the general trend of subsequent Christianity would have been changed. This of course must be said with great reserve. We can only know in part. But I think the difference between the piety of the Synoptics and that of the Epistles is most striking. The former is normal, the latter neurotic.

In general contrast with saints of the self-torturing type, St. Joan of Arc and St. Francis of Assisi[11] are notable. The secret of their lives was the beautiful harmony between the

[8-9] To such the universe was certainly a fraud, 'the transference of the libido ceases. The ascetic becomes *suspicious of real things and introverted*' (Pfister, 'The Psycho-Analytical Method,' p. 572).

[10] Contrast the perfect *balance* in Christ . . . 'wisdom . . . stature . . . favour with God . . . and man.'

[11] Speaking of these saints, M. K. Bradby says: 'In them conscious and unconscious spoke the same language' (*Psycho-Analysis*, pp. 24-25).

Conscious and the Unconscious. Here are saints universally loved. They lived in the Kingdom of Heaven. Inconsistent conduct, arising from internal conflict, is splendidly absent. In them is no unconscious self-hate, no awful power-lust. As true children of the Kingdom they delight us.

We turn to them with relief after a study of such a man as Romualdus. He fought the Devil day and night. 'Vanish, old snake,' he would cry. 'Back, unclean dog.' It was he, we read, who in order to make sure of his old father's ultimate entrance into the Kingdom in the next world, 'tied the old sinner's feet to a beam, fettered him with chains, and flogged him. And all the poor old man had wished to do was to go out of his monastery-cell for a while and see a little life.[12]

It is truly difficult to see how an individual can live happily in this world if his ulterior motive is salvation in the next. His life is bound to be a discord. Enjoying neither the earth he lives in, nor the heaven he hopes for, what he *is* liable to enjoy is a Hell of his own making. In his attitude to Religion he embraces it, not because he loves it, but for what it will bring him. He has been well compared to the man who marries an heiress for her money. Nor is he unlike the man who listens to Beethoven, not because he even likes Beethoven, but because he thinks Beethoven will do him good. The man who listens to 'Ta-ra-ra-boom-de-ay' with whole-souled enjoyment is nearer the Kingdom than he. For this man has forgotten himself: he worships, and the true note of the Kingdom is worship. The object of the worship in this case is, of course, not ideal; but, as Mr. Chesterton says, it is better to worship cats or crocodiles than self.

When the whole of the 'life-urge,' the '*libido*,' is directed, harmoniously, to an object outside the self, greater, more lovely, than the self, then a man begins to enter the Kingdom.[13] He becomes one of the 'pure in heart' who see God. He is, that is to say, single-minded, without ulterior motive. The men of the

[12] Romualdus, 'whose life passion it was to wrest men from the world and turn them into anchorites,' was, says Bradby, consumed with self hate and power-lust in his unconscious self (p. 228) (v. also Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind*, vol 1, c. 16).

[13] 'To see things in a relation of spiritual use to ourselves, that is sin. It is a perversion and misuse of the Spirit' (Brock).

Romualdus type, discordant and complex-ridden, do not see God. They see the Devil.

For these reasons I would urge that the pilgrim-ethic has often given a wrong twist to our Christianity and clouded the conception of the Kingdom. Nor is a Prayer Book which is full of the 'attain Thy heavenly promises' and 'be plenteously rewarded' element very helpful. A Prayer Book which emphasizes the 'hope of everlasting life,' and omits any real explication of Our Lord's central teaching, is not likely to inspire the present generation.

And after all, as a recent writer has said, 'the desire, over and above all other considerations, for our own continuance for ever and ever has nothing very noble or religious about it. And if goodness is regarded merely as the price to be paid for this, then such a religion falls below the level of morality altogether.'[14]

Its ethic is not the ethic of the normal, but of the thwarted and self-absorbed. Among such it had its origin, and among such it must always find a welcome. But it is without any dynamic save the egocentric. This is very different from the ethic which underlies the words, 'He that is willing to lose his life for My sake and the Gospel's, the same shall keep it to life eternal. Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all things needful for this life shall be added unto you, be not anxious about the morrow, for the morrow shall be anxious for itself.'[15]

[14] We have lost much by confusing 'pure in heart' with the idea of chastity.

[15] *Cf.* H. Anson, *A Practical Faith* (p. 66).

FALSE GODS

By the Right Reverend A. A. David, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool.

I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth.—St. John, xvi, 12 and 13.

JESUS here declares that it is impossible for Him to reveal to the men of His time the whole of the truth about God. They could not have borne it. They could understand God only in relation to their own knowledge of themselves, and of the world in which they lived. That knowledge was to grow in the experience of those who should come after them, and with it should grow human knowledge about God. In that sense truth is a living and a growing thing, and in order to secure that life and growth the Spirit was given. In every generation He guides us into new truth, ready to grow out of the old. What is the aspect or part of the whole truth for which we of this generation have been specially prepared?

We have inherited and are developing a new knowledge of the universe. For us its limits are pushed back into the infinite, which is only a way of saying that its magnitude exceeds our power to conceive or measure it. Its contents are too vast and various for mind or memory to hold. Our own world, which to men of old was the centre of the whole system, now appears as only one of many planets attached to one of countless suns. At the other end of the scale we can discern and deal with organisms of a minuteness undreamed of by our ancestors. We have a new sense of the vastness of Creation's range. This alone should bring with it a new sense of the greatness of God.

Jesus set that greatness before the men of His time. When they asked to be taught how to pray, He told them first to see God expecting and welcoming their approach as of children to their father, and next to remind themselves of His great glory; 'Hallowed be Thy Name.' But He could not teach them how great God is, because their standards of greatness were too low. Our standards are still not high enough.

No human standard ever can be high enough. Yet they are higher than of old. We can bear a greater conception of God.

But have we risen to it? Neither by research, nor by reflection, nor even by imagination can we compass the majesty of God, but our idea of Him must at least grow with our growing knowledge of His creation. A poet writes of a man whose vision of God kept pace with his extending horizons :

> As wider skies broke on his view,
> God greatened in his growing mind,
> Each year he dreamed his God anew,
> And left his older God behind.
> He saw the boundless scheme dilate
> In star and blossom, sky and clod,
> And as the universe grew great
> He dreamed for it a greater God.

But this special revelation of the Spirit to the men of this age has to contend with special difficulties, and some of them are entrenched in the religious thinking of what is still a considerable number of people. There are some who deny that our new knowledge of the world has anything to do with God. They have closed their minds to scientific discovery and to its results, and they try to shut God out of it. That means that they restrict their conception of God within the limits set by the mental outlook of a bygone age. They resent as irreligious all attempts to liberate our vision of Him from the shackles of human ignorance. They are content with, indeed they cling to, an idea of God narrower and smaller than our knowledge of His works.

Others there are who constrict their conception of His nature and activity by insisting that it must conform to their particular statement of some particular doctrine. Some, for instance, refuse to see His Spirit at work anywhere except through the ordered channels of the Church. If you invite them to recognize the Spirit of God in what they disparage as the 'natural' goodness of men, they reply that to see Him there would be contrary to the doctrine of the 'total depravity of human nature.' This is to tie Him down to a single aspect (imperfectly stated) of the truth. Others again are similarly preoccupied with particular methods of approaching Him. They insist so strongly upon the practice of prayer or attendance at the Sacrament that they seem to neglect the Person who stands behind both.

Now all this is of the nature of idolatry. By this word I do not mean the worshipping of images. That is only a symptom of idolatry. The essential error of an idolater is that he is satis-

fied with an inadequate conception of God. He has made for himself a little god, fashioned and fitted to his own ideas (or the ideas of the party to which he belongs), cribb'd, cabin'd, and confin'd in various traditional dogmas, rites, and liturgies.

For such there is only one deliverance. They must see God as He is. They must hallow His name. That is what Isaiah said to the idolaters of his day. They had made a god, each for himself, the rich man of gold, the poor man of wood, and they were satisfied. They looked no further than the limits of their handiwork.

Jesus was very patient then with those who could not open their eyes, so fast were they closed by the tyranny of tradition, and the blinding hold of lesser loyalties. And still we have need of His patience. There are some of us now who cannot see above and beyond the safe walls of party or of sect. They do not know that walls not only shelter, they shut out the view. These are still in bondage to some little god. But there are others whose minds and spirits claim and use the freedom wherewith Christ hath set us free to see the Father and to hallow His name. To them all the differences that engross so many Christians now sink into small significance, for their eyes have seen the King in His beauty.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PULPIT-TEACHING OF DEAN RASHDALL*

Among those who during the last thirty or forty years have rendered conspicuous service to the cause of liberal theology in the Church of England, no name is more widely known and more deservedly honoured than that of the late Dr. Hastings Rashdall, Dean of Carlisle. As Historian, Philosopher, Theologian, he made contributions of admittedly first rank to all these branches of learning. A member of the Churchmen's Union, and its President at his death, he made frequent and valuable contributions to our Annual Conferences and to the pages of this journal. As a preacher he was less well known, but not less active, and among his literary remains are a number of unpublished sermons and addresses. From these the Principal and the Chaplain of Ripon Hall have selected twenty-six, most of which were delivered by the late Dean in University and Cathedral pulpits and in College Chapels. They show the same sanity, solidity and careful methodicity which mark all Dr. Rashdall's writings. There is nothing shallow or superficial about any of them. Nor is there any avoidance of difficulty for the sake of popularity; to this preacher, ear-tickling was an abomination. That his sermons contain no direct appeal to the emotions

**Principles and Precepts.* By Hastings Rashdall, D.D., D.C.L., D.Litt., F.B.A., sometime Dean of Carlisle. Selected and Edited by H. D. A. Major, D.D., and F. L. Cross, M.A., B.Sc. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Pp. 256. Price 6/-.)

and no merely ornamental phraseology is not wholly accounted for by the nature of the audiences to whom they were preached. Most people will regard them as addressed primarily to the reason; the Dean himself would not have quarrelled with this judgment provided that the reason be made to include the moral consciousness. For him, the moral consciousness was the anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast; if not the only anchor linking man to the spiritual world, it was certainly the one on which all others depend for their holding power. Any emotional 'religious experience' which could survive trifling or insincerity in the moral sphere, Dr. Rashdall regarded as a delusion and a snare of the devil.

The sermons in this collection are characteristically preceptual. This does not mean that they consist of 'precept upon precept, line upon line,' but of precept based on principles of which the preacher was never in doubt; and unless He whom the preacher owned and served as Master and Lord was wholly mistaken in His teaching about the Divine standard of judgment, they are the principles to which our adherence will matter supremely both now and when the strife of tongues is passing from our ears. Many of the sermons deal with questions of real practical difficulty to the thoughtful modern Christian, such as the nature of our Lord's teaching, ambition, the use of wealth, interest, almsgiving. Others deal with doctrinal matters—the Trinity, Atonement, Creation, Free-Will, Comparative Religion, Immortality and the finality of Christ's ideal. The treatment is never abstruse, but is modern, practical and definite. Two quotations may serve to illustrate:

> 'The higher the man, the higher his capacities, the less credible does it become that it was only for this life that he came into the world. And thus, even apart from the testimony of the Apostles to their vision of the risen Lord, the Christian's hope of immortality centres in Christ. Not only by His teaching, not only by the brief visions which followed His departure, but also because He has raised our ideal of humanity to its highest point, it is true that it is Christ, above all others, who has brought life and immortality to light.'

Or again:

> 'And is not this fact—that we can still look back upon the teaching of this one Teacher, upon Him alone in all human history, as the fullest expression and representative of the ideal which commands the homage of all that is best in the modern world—is not this a fact of tremendous significance, a fact not merely of ethical, but of theological significance? . . . Can it be wrong to describe Him in such language as that of the Fourth Gospel or the Nicene Creed? . . . And yet, after all, let me most strenuously insist that the important thing for the conduct of each individual life is not the exact language in which we express these truths, but the extent to which we practically take up that attitude towards Christ which they represent. . . . In that practical following of Christ, and not in holding any propositions about His Person, however true they may be, lies that way of salvation which He came to bring into the world.'

This is a book which all readers of *The Modern Churchman* will wish to possess. Not only will it bring personal profit to themselves; it will also be extremely valuable as a means by which to introduce their more thoughtful friends to definitely Modernist teaching in a not too technical form, particularly to those of such friends as may be inclined to regard Modernism as an invitation to leave the firm footholds of an established faith for a plunge into a fathomless vacuity.

It may be added that the book contains an excellent photographic reproduction of the portrait of the author by Bernard Munns, the original of which hangs in Ripon Hall. J.S.B.

CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM IN AN INDIAN SOUL.*

To Canon Streeter and Mr. Appasamy the English reading public owed their first introduction to the Sâdhu Sundar Singh in 1921. Much has happened since then. The Roman Catholics have attacked the Sâdhu bitterly and repeatedly as a religious imposter. The leader of this attack is Fr. Hosten, S.J. An equally fierce attack, led by Dr. O. Pfister, has been made from the side of the new psychology. The leader of the defence is Dr. Friedrich Heiler, Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of Marburg, the chief exponent of German Modernism. His reply to the Jesuits is contained in *Apostel oder Betrüger?* That to Herr Pfister in *Christuszeuge oder Hysteriker?* Neither has yet been translated into English. The English public are, however, most fortunate in having access to Heiler's *Sâdhu Sundar Singh Ein Apostel des Ostens und Westens,* translated by Olive Wyon from the Fourth German Edition and published this year.

It is difficult for any unprejudiced investigator not to be impressed by the Sâdhu's sincerity : it is of course possible that he is self-deceived, but investigation of those incidents which lend themselves most readily to this interpretation seem to prove them to be actual facts, not the fancies of a visionary. Heiler is full of admiration for him. For Heiler he is a Christian saint, an inspired teacher possessed of wonderful mystical experience, from which both West and East have much to learn.

Born a Sikh, in an ancient and aristocratic family, blest with a most religious mother, he was piously brought up in his ancestral religion, which seeks to achieve a higher synthesis of Hinduism and Islam. Dissatisfied not only with Sikhism, but also with Islam and Hinduism, he turned to the New Testament. It attracted, but did not win him. He opposed Christian missions, but was converted in his sixteenth year by a vision of Christ. Disinherited, he went out with his New Testament and a small bundle of provisions to tread 'the way of homelessness.' He entered the Presbyterian Mission School at Ludhiana, and was transferred to Subathu. He was baptized at Simla according to the English rite. He then went forth as a Christian missionary, clad in the sacred yellow robe. He depended on alms, but never begged. He later joined Mr. Stokes, who came to preach the Gospel like a Franciscan friar. From him he learnt much of St. Francis. He also read the *Imitatio Christi* of à Kempis. He declined to be ordained or to join a brotherhood ; he received a preacher's licence from the Anglican authorities, but afterwards returned it, although he continued to preach in Anglican churches. He preached much and practised fasting to an extreme degree. He tried to enter Tibet and at last succeeded. Here he endured persecutions. In 1916 he began to be well known, and in his mission journeys, especially in South India, he attracted immense numbers. He visited Europe : many books and articles were written about him : he became a religious celebrity. To many he seemed to be an incarnation of the Spirit of Christ. Through it all he retained his humility. This appears in an utterance of his which Dr. Heiler puts on the title-page of his book :

'To listen to *my* voice will do you no good ; you must hear His Voice. Go into stillness, then you will hear Him speaking, and you

**The Gospel of Sâdhu Sundar Singh.* By Friedrich Heiler, Ph.D., D.D. ; abridged translation by Olive Wyon. (Allen and Unwin. 1927. 12/6.)

will understand what a man has found for himself who came to you from a heathen land. *Christ alone is salvation.* He who comes to Him becomes dead to sin and enters into eternal life.'

Dr. Heiler's work falls into five parts. I, The Ancestral Faith of Sundar Singh; II, His Life Story; III, His Religious Life; IV, His Religious Thought-world; V, His Significance for the Christian Religion, for India, and for Western Christianity.

It seems to us that the message of the Sâdhu is this: 'It is the Living Christ who makes Christianity.' That affirmation contains many implications which cannot be discussed in this notice of Dr. Heiler's admirable book.

Dr. Heiler in writing of the Sâdhu's mystical experiences, published in his little book *Visions of the Spiritual World*, writes:

> 'As his (the Sâdhu's) Bishop has sanctioned its publication, and has even recommended it in his Foreword, no truly Catholic-minded Christian can disapprove. The Church, speaking through the Bishops, is the final judge in all questions of extraordinary mystical experience' (pp. 108, 109).

This seems a dangerous *dictum*. What about the episcopal judges of Joan of Arc? H.D.A.M.

AFRIC'S SUNNY FOUNTAINS.*

George Grenfell by H. L. Hemmens, and *World Evangelisation* by the Rev. David Jenks, provide an able description from different points of view of the missionary work of the Church. The first forms an addition to the Modern Series of Missionary Biographies and gives a graphic account of the pioneer work of the Baptist missionary in the Congo. It maintains the high standard of the previous volumes both in interest and thoroughness, and presents us with a figure which lives and appeals. Grenfell early showed that he had inherited the adventurous spirit of his illustrious Elizabethan ancestor. He read widely—especially the writings of Livingstone—and, when hardly out of his 'teens, he edited the 'Mission Work' and endeavoured to provide information about every Christian effort abroad. After a brief college career he set out for Africa, and reached the Cameroons in 1874. His restless ambitions allowed him to recognize no obstacles, and almost at once he began his work of exploring the river system in order that he might push further inland: often he found himself among peoples quite untouched by Western influences, pursuing their crude cults and customs; though occasionally he records his surprise at their skilled crafts. Difficulties were enormous, but he veiled them with a touch of humour. 'I have not yet,' he wrote, 'discover'd Afric's sunny Fountains! Afric's decomposed-organic-matter-in-suspension-laden streams abound.'

But his greatest work owed its inspiration to Stanley's journey across the Continent. This aroused that enthusiasm among the Baptists which led to the formation of the Congo Mission (1877), and of this Grenfell was given the charge. He was admirably suited to the task to which he gave the rest of his life, and one can only wonder how in spite of so many setbacks to his work both as missioner and explorer—though for him the two were never separate—he achieved so much. For nearly thirty years he carried on a work of extraordinary adventure and achievement, now plodding on through swamp and forest to find a place suitable for a base or advancing to meet the Chief to the inharmonious accompaniment of the

**George Grenfell, Pioneer in Congo.* By H. L. Hemmens. (S.C.M. 5/-.)
**A Study of World Evangelisation.* By David Jenks. (S.C.M. 4/- and 2/6.)

Court *orchestra*, now supervising the building of his first steamer in sections in London or organizing the carrying of those sections overland for 260 miles—and showing anxiety over a missing part which a native, finding it somewhat heavy, had dumped!—and then reconstructing and launching it on the Congo. By means of it he carried out extensive voyages of exploration, covering as much as 15,000 miles in two years. To many places he came as the first white man; others had known the white man to their cost—in terms of liquor and slaves. Everywhere he encountered the awful terror of the unknown which gripped men, and the atrocious cruelties of the savage cult which it encouraged. At one place the natives concluded that he and his strange oarless boat had come from the spirit world; hence they refused to give them food—an effective way of exorcizing the spirits, since in the absence of food the missioners had to retreat! But the establishment of a mission station there, later, shows that the repulse was only temporary. Grenfell's influence over natives was as amazing as his zeal was unconquerable. 'I don't write my sermons now,' he records. 'One has to talk very plainly and very simply and give it in small doses and hit hard to reach these folk.' He continued preaching and exploring and establishing stations through a very crowded life: the last was well over 1,000 miles inland, and the long journey had been not only scientifically explored, but described by a huge chart which showed the result of his investigation of the main river and its upper approaches. 'Parallel with this draughtmanship he classified his vast store of notes on natural history, folk-lore, religious beliefs, customs, language and all else that he had accumulated' (p. 122). His life was a curious blend of sunshine and shadow, but his indomitable courage and unswerving zeal for the Gospel brought success through adventures which make his biography a fascinating story.

Mr. Jenks' book is of small scope, but it contains a wealth of information. The early part of the book dealing with evangelization within and without the Empire before the fifteenth century suffers inevitably from compression, but the interest of the study deepens as it touches the modern world, and the last seven chapters are an able study of the difficulties, problems and achievements of modern evangelization. The writer's criticisms, whether of the Crusades or of the Jesuits, of Protestant indifference or of a sectarian 'zeal not according to knowledge' are searching and often illuminating. The elaborate division of the book into chapters and sections does not promote unity, but this, with the very detailed 'Contents,' should make it an easy one for the purpose of study—which purpose the author had chiefly in mind.

J.P.H.

BRITISH CHRISTIANITY.*

Students beginning the study of English Church History, and clergymen and schoolmasters who have to teach it either in school or in popular lectures, will place a high value on Mr. Allison's well arranged, well documented, and accurate lecture notes on English Church History from the earliest times to the Reformation. We have examined a number of books of this kind, and have no hesitation in asserting that it is much the best of them. Owing to the judicious selection of points for treatment and the apposite character of the foot-notes, the reader escapes the weariness which too often befalls the student of such helps to knowledge. When once begun it is an extremely difficult book to lay down.

**Lectures on Church History.* By T. Allison, M.A. (Basil Blackwell. 1927. 7/6 net.)
**The Celtic Church and the See of Peter.* By John Campbell MacNaught, B.D. (Basil Blackwell. 1927. 7/6 net.)

Mr. MacNaught's *The Celtic Church and the See of Peter* deserves serious attention from those who on historical grounds deny the Papal claim to reverence and obedience from the Christians of the British Isles. By patient historical investigation Mr. MacNaught shows that the weight of the evidence is against the claim that the ancient Celtic Church was independent of Rome. By this claim is not meant merely that it was to a great extent left to manage its own affairs, but that it rejected the claim of the Bishop of Rome to be, under Christ, the Chief Pastor of the whole flock of Christ on earth, the visible Head of the visible Church. The investigator of this claim, who is a Presbyterian, was strongly biassed in its favour when he began his research, but he ended it convinced that the Roman Primacy was recognized by the Celtic Church, and that this Primacy was not only a primacy of honour but also of jurisdiction.

It has been often urged by Anglicans that the refusal of the British Bishops to acknowledge Augustine of Canterbury as their chief and to co-operate with him proves that they did not acknowledge the Papal supremacy. This proof fails (1) because nothing is said of their rejection of the Papacy. Had they rejected it, this would certainly have been charged against them by their accusers. (2) Because for many centuries after Augustine the British or Welsh Bishops refused to be subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury yet remained devoted to the See of Peter. (3) Because it is possible to refuse obedience to one's superior when he commands one to do what one believes is wrong without rejecting his claim to be obeyed when he commands one to do what is right.

The difference between Roman and Celtic Church customs, discussed at Whitby, has had too much weight laid on it by Anglican controversialists.

Mr. MacNaught's book is clear and simple; he certainly presents his case strongly and, we cannot but hold, convincingly. The translation which he gives of the famous passage from *Irenaeus* iii, 3 is inaccurate: *convenire ad* is not rightly rendered 'agree with.' H.D.A.M.

HELPS TO BIBLE STUDY.*

Bible-readers will be attracted by the first four pleasant little volumes in the Study Bible Series on *Genesis, Psalms, St. Luke* and *Hebrews*. The volumes are described in a sub-title as 'A Little Library of Exposition with New Studies.' The critical student will not find in them what will satisfy him, neither will the devout traditionalist. The readers who appreciate the Saturday religious articles in *The Times* will like these volumes. They breathe their spirit. They interest and instruct in an easy, informal way without making any large demand on the knowledge or intelligence of their readers. Some would call them devotional, but they are better described as reflective and suggestive. They contain many quotations intended to illustrate their more important texts: the quotations are never provocative; they incline to be sedative and edificatory and are by well-known writers. The picture illustrations strike us as conventional and unattractive.

A very different kind of help to Bible Study is provided by Mr. Kenneth Luce's practical and provocative volume, *St. Mark's Gospel in English.*

**The Study Bible,* A Little Library of Exposition with New Studies. *Genesis,* by E. Griffith-Jones, D.D., and A. C. Welch, D.D. *Psalms,* by L. Maclean Watt, D.D., and J. E. McFadyen, D.D. *S. Luke,* by F. W. Norwood, D.D., and F. R. Barry, D.S.O., M.A. *Hebrews,* by W. R. Inge, C.V.O., D.D., and H. L. Goudge, M.A., D.D. Cassell and Co. 1926. Each volume 3/6 net.)

**St. Mark's Gospel in English.* By Harry Kenneth Luce, M.A., Master of the King's Scholars, Westminster. (A. and C. Black. 1926. 3/6 net.)

Mr. Luce is a public school master, and this volume is a companion to his *St. Matthew's Gospel in English.* It contains an excellent introduction, clear, concise and candid. The same may be said of the comments on the text. Those who use these commentaries may at a later stage find that they have much more to learn about the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew, but they will find that they have little to unlearn. These commentaries do not simply impart information; they provoke questions and stimulate instead of suffocating thought, and not least where their user finds himself in serious disagreement with the commentator. We know no better commentaries than Mr. Luce's for those schools in which the Greek text is not used. They require a teacher who can exact serious attention from his scholars. The human boy will not be as attracted to them as to a detective story. They are intended for study, not for recreation. With a good teacher we feel sure that they can arouse a growing interest.

SOME SMALL BOOKS.*

Small books are not necessarily unimportant books, any more than small poems are insignificant poems. *Eucharist and Sacrifice** by Professor Burkitt is of great value. It first appeared as an article in *The Interpreter* (since expired), and we called attention to it and cited it in our preface to the Modern Churchmen's Conference Papers of 1926 as the best treatment, with which we were acquainted, of the relation of Sacrament to Sacrifice in the Eucharist of the English Church. To the question: Where is the Sacrifice in the English Communion Service? Professor Burkitt makes answer: The congregation offer unto God their souls and bodies to be a reasonable sacrifice. 'This is the Sacrifice of the existing English Use.' He adds this significant note to his paper:

> 'The only change I would make in the present Communion Service is to change the Rubric *Or this* into *And this* [before the second post-Communion Thanksgiving]; ending the second Prayer with "Jesus Christ our Lord" without repeating the Doxology.'

Hardly less important than Dr. Burkitt's contribution is Archdeacon Hunkin's *The Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Prayer of Consecration.*[1] It is an admirable example of Cambridge scholarship. His conclusion is as follows:

> 'In the world with which Natural Science has to do, the world of Physics and Chemistry, no change takes place with consecration in the bread and wine, nor can we find any religious value in supposing such a change.'

The Archdeacon maintains that the effect of the Eucharist is spiritual and is to be looked for in the spiritual world; that world to which we as spiritual beings essentially belong. The only way of presenting anything that takes place in that world to our minds is to keep it associated with persons in the closest possible manner. He then adds:

> 'As far as the Liturgy is concerned, this is done sufficiently in the alternative Communion Office proposed: it was done rather more satisfactorily, perhaps, in the Grey Book: in Cranmer's words preserved in our Book of Common Prayer it is done most effectively of all.'

The Revised Prayer-Book of 1927[2] by Canon Hopkin James, LL.D.,

* Published by Heffer's, Cambridge (1927), price 1/-.
1 Published by Heffer's, Cambridge (1927), price 1/-.
2 Published by the Western Mail, Ltd. (1927), price 1/6.

and *The New Prayer-Book*[3] by Dr. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, are whole-hearted defences of the Deposited Book. The Canon's book is the more popular, the Bishop's more erudite. Each presents his case in an eminently judicious and persuasive manner. All parish priests would do well to use either of these books in commending the Deposited Book to their people.

Our Lord's Quotations from the Old Testament[4] by the Rev. Ernest Clapton is a thoughtful and careful piece of work. The lesson of the book is thus summarized:

> 'The study of our Lord's quotations from the Old Testament shows that He read the Scriptures in a way that was not customary when Scribes and Pharisees thought more of supporting their own dogmas than of searching for the spiritual message; and we need to learn from Him so to read the Scriptures as to understand their real import.'

This is a useful book for leaders of study-circles. Mr. Clapton does not appear to know W. Dittmar's invaluable *Vetus Testamentum in Novo.*

H.D.A.M.

[3] Published by John Murray (1927), price 2/6.
[4] Published by Skeffington's (1927). price 1/6.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

I am prompted to write in gratitude for the article on '*The Christian Doctrine of Forgiveness*' by Dr. Douglas White.

No one who has not agonised over theories of 'The Atonement' can understand the anguish which a soul may have to endure until able to rest in the good news that 'God is Love.' Would that our historic creeds embodied this essential fact of Christianity!

I wonder how many now-a-days read the works of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, which had so great an influence on McLeod Campbell, Maurice, Stanley and other Modernists of the 19th century.

His *Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel,* published in 1828, may still be read with advantage by those who find it difficult to accept the reconciliation view of the Atonement emphasised by Dr. White. Erskine goes to the root of the matter when he says:—

> 'To a moral and thinking being it cannot but appear strange that God should pardon him because he believes something—would it not be a blessed relief to that soul to be assured that Christ died not for believers but for the world, that He was promised as a deliverer before there was one penitent or believing thought in any human breast—when God in Christ forgives the world, the world is forgiven *whether it accepts the pardon or not.*'

Truly a glorious gospel this, in contrast to any 'satisfaction' theories of 'The Atonement.'

R. CROMWELL EDWARDS.

Staines,
20th June, 1927.

[But is this quite the teaching of our Lord? He taught truly that while the Divine Father is ever ready to forgive, yet His forgiveness demands forgivableness in the sinner. This forgivableness is exhibited by true sorrow for sin and by a readiness to forgive others, *i.e.,* a spirit of repentance and love.—ED. *M.C.*]